LEVEL ONE

The American Church Monthly

September, 1917 20 Cents

I Know There Is a God
Una A. Hunt - - - - - - - - 1

St. Boniface, the Popes and the Karlings
Benjamin W. Wells, Ph. D. - - - - 2

The Scope or Field of Episcopal Jurisdiction
The Rev. C. P. A. Burnett, B. D. - 25

The Use and Abuse of Church History
IV Constructive History
The Rev. Arthur W. Jenks, D.D. - - 34

Selected—The Church and the People—The Sabbath for Man—The Creed and the Imagination - - - 47

The Church at Work
The Church Periodical Club
Mary E. Thomas - - - - - - 58
A Day's Work at the Church Missions House
Kathleen Hore - - - - - - - 60

Editorial Comment - - - - - - - - - 64

Book Reviews - - - - - - - - - - - 69

Entered as second-class matter May 10, 1917, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under Act of March 3, 1879

THE EUCHARISTIC OFFERING

Spiritual instructions upon the Office of Holy Communion, together with helps for carrying out of the same. Including a Kalendar for the Commemoration of Persons and Events. A method of Eucharistic Preparation, Intercession and Thanksgiving. The Office analyzed, annotated and accompanied with Devotions adapted to its several parts. An arrangement of Collects, Epistles and Gospels whereby the Eucharistic Thought proper for the day is made plain.

BY

The Rt. Rev. G. H. S. WALPOLE, S. T. D., Bishop of Edinburgh, Scotland

Sometime Professor of Dogmatic Theology in the General Theological Seminary, New York
With introduction by the late Rev. Morgan Dix, S. T. D., D. C. L.

Bound in Cloth, Red Edges. Price, 75 cents. If sent by mail, 80 cents

R. W. CROTHERS

Nineteenth Street and Irving Place, New York City

CHURCH VESTMENTS AND EMBROIDERIES

Miss Alice Veader, 32 Highland Street, New Haven, Conn., will fill orders for Church Vestments and Embroideries of all kinds. Miss Veader finds it possible to execute her work for very moderate prices, though she uses the best materials and aims at the highest workmanship. She also lays to heart the admonition of George Herbert of blessed memory, "No light colors or foolish anticks."

SAMPLES, DESIGNS AND ESTIMATES ON APPLICATION

ST. STEPHEN'S COLLEGE

Annandale-on-Hudson, N. Y.

A Church College offering a thorough education leading to the degrees of B.A. or Ph.B. Special advantages for students intending to study for Holy Orders. Charges for Tuition, Room, Board, Heat and Light, only $425 a year. For catalogue and fuller information, apply to

THE REV. PRESIDENT RODGERS.

PUBLICATIONS by the late The Rev. H. PAGE DYER are now for sale by the Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament
14 East 109th St., New York

Cathedral Studio

Supplies every kind of

CHURCH EMBROIDERY

Specialties: English Silk Stoles, Handsome Crosses, $5.50; Plain, $3.50; Handsome Gift Stoles, $10 upward.

MISS MACKRILLE

11 W. Kirke St., Chevy Chase, Washington, D. C.

ECCLESIASTICAL and DOMESTIC ART WORKER, MEMORIAL WINDOWS, LEADED GLASS, MONUMENTS, MEMORIAL TABLETS, CHURCH FURNISHINGS.

Write CHARLES F. HOGEMAN

45 SEVENTH AVE. NEW YORK CITY

The American Church Monthly

is for sale at the following places:

NEW YORK:
E. S. Gorham, 9 and 11 West 45th St.
R. W. Crothers, 122 East 19th St.
Church Literature Press, 2 Bible House
Sunday School Commission, 73 Fifth Ave.
Brentano's, Fifth Ave. and 27th St.

BALTIMORE:
Lycett's, 317 North Charles St.

BOSTON:
Old Corner Bookstore, 27 and 29 Bromfield St.

CHICAGO:
A. C. McClurg & Co., 218 South Wabash Ave.

PHILADELPHIA:
George W. Jacobs & Co., 1628 Chestnut St.

ROCHESTER, N. Y.:
Scranton, Wetmore & Co.

MILWAUKEE:
The Young Churchman Co., 484 Milwaukee St.

WASHINGTON:
Woodward & Lathrop, Inc.

The American Church Monthly

A Magazine of comment, criticism and review dealing with questions confronting the Anglican Communion and more especially the Church in the United States

Volume II SEPTEMBER, 1917 Number 1

I Know There Is a God

I KNOW there is a God,
When winter's cloak of snow
Has hushed to sleep the garden
With gentle dreams to grow.

I know there is a God,
When rushing spring arrives
With floods of poignant beauty
To blossom in our lives.

I know there is a God,
When calm in summer days
I watch the corn fields growing,
And fruitfulness gives praise.

I know there is a God,
When autumn's trees are clad
In hues of gay rejoicing
To teach us death is glad.

Una A. Hunt.

Saint Boniface, the Popes and the Karlings

ST. BONIFACE is popularly known as the Apostle of the Germans. The title is misleading. The honor that is due him is very great, but it is that of the organizer of the German Church, of a reformer of German ecclesiastical and religious conditions, and above all of a great founder of mediaeval Church unity, rather than that of a missionary pioneer. It is not recorded that Boniface ever preached the Gospel where it had not been preached before; it is certain that he never preached it where it did not sorely need to be preached again.

From 716, when Boniface first went to Frisia, to his martyrdom, probably in 754, the records are quite full, though they are often incomplete, not always clear and apparently sometimes inconsistent.[1]

For their study one needs an appreciation of the very artificial style of the time, especially of its ecclesiastics. No less needful is knowledge of the political situation in which Popes and Karlings found themselves in the first half of the eighth century and of the great changes wrought in the preceding years in the English and German Churches. Against such a background the correspondence, lives and legends of Boniface get new meanings. He has seemed to students equally sincere, now an apostolic prince of the Church, now a fanatical destroyer of evangelical liberty, " a great Saul, a Paul never ". The truth lies between. Boniface was not a great originator; he was a great executive, but he was greater still as a man, a type of the best in Anglo-Saxon character.

[1] Boniface's correspondence counts 99 letters written between 716 and 753. Of the early biographies Willibald's was written before 768, the Utrecht Priest's about 800, the *Passio* about 1011, Othlo's about 1065. These are conveniently presented in Jaffe's *Bibliotheca Rerum Germanicarum*, Vol. 3 (*Monumenta Moguntina*, 1866). The best general histories of the time are Mühlbacher's *Deutsche Geschichte unter Karolingern* (1896) and Hauck's *Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands* (1898). In the latter is a full bibliography of the significant Boniface literature. Noteworthy also is Tangl's *Das Todesjahr des Bonifatius* in *Zeitschrift des Vereins für hessische Geschichte und Landeskunde*, Vol. 37 (1903).

Boniface was an Englishman but he came to Germany from Rome. That was the result of no chance or accident. He was probably then well over forty-five. Of distinguished parentage, in his boyhood at Exeter and his youth at Nursling Abbey he had watched and shared in the West-Saxon enthusiasm for the great reform of his own Church by Theodore. At Nursling he had had for teacher Abbot Wynbert, who had once been chancellor to the West-Saxon king and could doubtless teach his eager pupil at least as much of diplomacy as of theology. His abilities as a scholar had already commanded general recognition and warm praise from Aldhelm. He had successfully conducted, probably in 710, certainly before 712, delicate negotiations as representative of a West-Saxon synod at Canterbury. He had gone with missionary purpose to Frisia in 716 but had been shrewd enough to see on looking over the ground that existing political conditions did not justify his remaining there as an uncommissioned worker. He had been offered the abbacy at Nursling. The commendatory letters that he took with him to Rome show that he was already in his own Church a man of mark. His determination to go to Germany by way of Italy was the result of deliberate judgment that one who had in him to do a work like Theodore's could make full use of his ability only if he spoke with the prestige of a commission from the Threshold of the Apostles that none could gainsay. His idea of the papacy was common in the England of his day. It was not common in Germany. If the Roman Church would send him there as its missionary he trusted himself to justify its trust.

To Gregory II such a missionary volunteer was most welcome. He was facing varied difficulties with consummate skill and Boniface could help in just the quarter where help gave most promise. On the borders of Christendom the Saracens were a growing menace. The first break in the advancing wave of their progress in Europe was still fourteen years away. Already it must have been clear to so shrewd an observer as Gregory that Karl Martel was the one man and the Franks the one people from whom safety could be had in that world

crisis. Till then the relations of the Frankish State Church to the curia had been occasional and irregular though not uncordial. The moral authority of the See of Peter was never questioned. Beyond this the Frankish princes, as Hauck observes, never contested in theory the claims of the Popes but acted as if these did not exist. Knowledge of transalpine ecclesiastical conditions was apparently not very intimate at Rome, but it was evident that a strengthening of ties might be, as indeed it soon after became, a matter of vital import to the temporal power of the papacy in its struggle with the Lombards. And then there was always a smouldering conflict with the Emperor at Constantinople, who had been making notable inroads on papal revenues in Greece, Sicily and Calabria. Moreover, a door had just been opened to him in Bavaria. No wonder Gregory turned his eyes expectantly northward. But such a commission as he had in mind was not for a chance volunteer. It was not till after varied tests of his orthodoxy, his loyalty and his ability that Boniface received appointment as papal missionary, May 15, 719. A pledge of obedience was exacted. It does not appear that any special field or form of work was stipulated. Boniface was, apparently, to look over the situation and report. Gregory would not hastily commit himself where issues, greater than Boniface yet imagined, were at stake. Possibly the Pope wished also to see whether the evidently profound impression that the Eternal City had made on the ardent missionary would stand the test of time. It had at least already so far prevailed as to induce him to exchange his Anglo-Saxon name Winfrid for what might pass for a Latin equivalent, Bonifatius, that is "fortunate," the Greek Eutyches.

To win Karl Martel was the goal of papal policy but, possibly for that very reason, his court, or the district under his immediate government, was not the missioner's first quest. He went over the Brenner Pass to half-independent Bavaria. There was double promise of welcome there. Three years before Duke Theodo, a pilgrim to Rome, had sought help from the

Pope for the ecclesiastical reorganization of his land, apparently without immediate result. Then, too, the Lombard Luitprand, with whom Boniface stopped on the way, had many English friends and was connected by marriage with the Bavarian dukes, so that through him there was promise of an introduction to Bavaria and of opportunity for inspection, as through windows, of neighborhood conditions in Austrasia and Thuringia. Bavaria was already, at least outwardly and nominally, Christian. Missionary work had begun here in Roman imperial days and had been vigorously prosecuted for the two preceding generations by Emmeran, Rupert and Corbinian. At the moment, however, Bavarian conditions were unfavorable to Boniface. The hierarchy desired no closer relations with the curia; the political conditions were fairly chaotic and promised to stay so till the Karlings should find time and occasion to establish a permanent ascendency. Here first, as throughout the whole of Boniface's work in Germany, sympathy and co-operation of the civil authority was a primary condition of success. Boniface invited it, waited for it, prepared the way for it with patient diplomacy. When and where he found it he was quick to seize opportunity and marvellously skillful in using it. When he did not find it he turned elsewhere, as now to Thuringia.

In this northern borderland of Frankish influence development, political and ecclesiastical, was naturally less advanced than in Bavaria. Leading men, especially Duke Hedan, had, however, been active in furthering Christian missions. Kilian, a Scotic monk, had maintained a mission station near Würzburg and found a martyr's death there late in the seventh century. Willibrord had been invited to come here from Frisia and grants of land had been made or offered to him in 704 and in 716. But the Saxons to the north, hereditary enemies of the Franks and so very averse to Christianity, had checked and were long to hinder its peaceful diffusion among the masses of the people. Many heathen practices survived, even among the baptized. We hear of priests who divided their allegiance between Christian altars and pagan shrines. Boni-

face, after a very brief stay, went westward, as though to Karl, but turned to the north and joined Willibrord in Frisia. Possibly he felt that Willibrord, a fellow countryman and a bishop who, after an understanding with the Frankish major-domo, had sought a Roman commission, had a prior claim on Thuringia or, in any case, could help him there. When he joined Willibrord, however, he found that political changes had transformed the missionary outlook. Many doors were opening on expanding prospects and Boniface remained with the aging bishop for some two years and a half, taking away with him, it seems, friendship and confidence when, in the spring of 722, he went up the Rhine to Hesse, just west of Thuringia. Here he was nearer than he had yet been to the court of Karl, who had been the mainstay of Willibrord's work. If Boniface had left Frisia with the estrangement that is read by many into the record, he would hardly have put himself so near the long arm of Martel.

In Hesse Boniface found twin princelings, Dettic and Deorulf, who gave him, possibly at Willibrord's suggestion, fertile land for a church and cloister at Amoeneburg. He now sent Bynnan to Rome to tell of his impressions and of the beginnings of settled work and, travelling about the region, began to organize such groups of Christians as he found, or could gather from the half persuaded, into a body that might offer effective resistance to the heathen Saxons and so serve his own catholicizing purpose and incidentally commend him to Karl. In this task he was engaged when he was summoned urgently to come to Rome. It was already clear that he was the man for the occasion. He was consecrated Bishop on St. Andrew's Day, 722. He made a formal profession of faith and took an oath of allegiance. In the main this was that customary for suburbican bishops, but it substituted for clauses obviously inapplicable others that seemed appropriate to the curial secretaries. And so the new bishop came to promise if he " learns that priests are living contrary to the ordinances of the holy fathers to have no fellowship or connection with them ", a clause that was to give him much perplexity of con-

science thereafter. His relations to Karl were left either to private conference or to his discretion. The promotion and the oath were both in the normal order of things. There was then probably no plan on either side to make Germany in any peculiar sense a " papal province ", though in Gregory's letter to Karl, telling him of the consecration, he claims rights in the Frankish Church that the papacy did not then in fact possess. It was hoped, and with good cause, to substitute for the undisciplined individualism of Scotic missionaries and their Frankish emulators such organization and discipline as at that time could come to Northwestern Europe only through the fellowship, the traditions, and the prestige of Rome. It was high time to form a German Church and, as has been well said, the Scots could never have organized a German Church for they had no organization themselves. Here as in England they had done noble work and left a glorious heritage into which it was now time for others to enter if it was to endure. Thus Boniface was working in the spirit of Theodore of Canterbury, in a like situation, toward the same goal. What he had at heart was not aggrandizement of papal temporal power but that Christians should, so far as in him lay, present a united front to pagan and Saracen. His was no blind allegiance. If Roman practices seemed to him to stand in the way of unity, he did not hesitate to speak his mind, and to the Pope first of all. That was his idea of loyal service and it is no bad one.

Boniface had been consecrated *episcopus regionarius*. He was to create his own diocese. For material assistance he looked always to England, rather than to Rome, and to his own field more than to either. Gregory's letter to Karl says Boniface is sent " to preach to people of the German race and to those who live east of the Rhine in the illusion of heathendom or the darkness of ignorance." Boniface delivered the letter in the spring of 723 and received the equivalent of a passport, giving him safe-conduct and right of appeal " if anything happens to him that cannot be settled legally ". This was only matter of routine. In return Karl exacted an

express profession of allegiance to his *dominio ac patrocinio.* It is notable, too, that the passport states that it is issued at Boniface's own request. The Pope's letter is ignored, although we know that it was customary in these passports to give the names of the patrons of the receiver. All this illustrates the ways of Frankish diplomacy. It did not controvert unwelcome claims, it ignored them. Karl had no present use for a reformer in Austrasia; a stronger Church beyond the Rhine would make Thuringia more effective as a buffer against the Saxons. Karl in these years was laying the final courses in the deep foundation of what was to be the kingdom of Pipin and the empire of Charlemagne. The years since 714 when he took the reins of government had been full of struggle, none of them more than those now before him when he was to earn the title Martel, the Hammer, on the field of Poictiers. It was a time to engross the mind of the greatest ruler of his day and the resources of the nation that promised most for the future of Europe. Karl would have brooked at that time no intervention in the Church of Austrasia where the exigencies of the political situation had seemed to him to justify the alienation of a large part of the ecclesiastical income. An indefinite " primacy of honor " Karl and the Frankish clergy would unquestionably have accorded to Rome, but that Karl was master in the Church of his land he never allowed to be questioned, and his clergy, for reasons not altogether to their credit, wished to have it so. Indeed when once Boniface complained to Rome of the attempted intrusion of a Frankish bishop on his field the Pope was content to turn the case over to Karl's good will. But if the Frankish parishes were often impoverished, if abbacies and sees were frequently the reward of service on battlefields in defence of the nation, those who denounce Karl as a despoiler of the Church should not forget that a unique place in his century as the protector of Christendom and of civilization is his due.

For the next ten years Boniface, neither directly helped by Karl nor hindered by him, gave himself to spreading and confirming Christian communities in Hesse and Thuringia,

never going beyond the range of Karl's protection but devoting chief attention to the Saxon border, opposing the inroads of heathenism and destroying what might aid in its revival, as, for instance, the oak at Geismar. The whole trend of the time was so obviously away from paganism in Thuringia that the tales of baptized myriads are not improbable, but of course pagan usages survived, as in such cases they always do, often for centuries. Some of these gave Boniface much anxiety, as appears constantly in his letters to the very end. More perplexing still were the "false priests," who, living among a people of low culture and themselves without organization, discipline or oversight had become a law to themselves and no longer drew a clear line between Christianity and heathenism. Celibacy was disregarded here as throughout Austrasia, where manners at that time may be described as "imperfectly monogamous". Then, too, there were Scotic missionaries, not altogether worthy successors of Columban, Gall and Kilian, eccentric wanderers for the greater part, sometimes with a considerable following. When Boniface would restrain their license, they defended themselves, as they have since been defended, in the name of liberty, but it is clear enough that their day was over. It was not in them to make a German Church.

The helpers in Boniface's work were mainly volunteers from the English cloisters. Their laborers were directed, wisely and in accord with experience in their own nation, to the leading men. Where these led it was part of the Teutonic social order that the rest should follow. *Cuius regio eius religio* was as true then of Germany as ever it was later. The overlord commanded, the vassals came *en masse* to baptism. They had been taught the husk of the faith. It was for missionaries from the monastic settlements to show them what they could of its kernel, largely in house to house talks which apparently they mingled with instructions in arts and husbandry. So the community spirit grew in Thuringia and these Germans got a new understanding of Christian unity, brotherhood and social service.

News of the accession of Gregory III brought from Boniface in 732 a report of progress. The response was an archbishop's pallium and permission to select as well as consecrate bishops. This right, however, he did not find expedient to exercise for seven years. Karl was otherwise occupied and it would have been indiscreet to consecrate any bishop for a part of his jurisdiction in his absence or behind his back, the more as just now the relations of the curia with Constantinople and with the Lombards were growing worse and the friendship of the Frankish majordomos was becoming a vital matter at Rome. Boniface, writing confidentially of his troubles to Bishop Daniel of Winchester, says: "Without the help of the prince of the Franks I can neither govern the people of the Church, nor defend priests or clerks, monks or nuns." So, his work held at a standstill in Thuringia, Boniface turned in 734 to Bavaria. Here, however, the situation proved unfavorable for anyone who was thought to represent Frankish interests. There followed a period of "marking time," months of study and writing, closing with a third visit to Rome in 737.

Boniface remained a year in Italy seeking his soul's health at various pilgrim shrines. It was at Gregory's desire rather than his own that he returned to take up once more his work in Thuringia. Gregory also suggested that he should call a synod of Alamanian and Bavarian bishops, and in a general letter summoned them to lay aside heathen practices and to hold annual councils "where Boniface might bid and under his presidency." This showed, as soon appeared, a radical misconception of the attitude of those countries toward one another and toward anybody from Frankish Thuringia. Gregory seems to have hoped for reorganization here without cooperation of civil authorities. Boniface was too prudent to make any such attempt. What the heads of such ancient Church centres as Augsburg, Spires, Constance, Passau and Strassburg thought of the rather peremptory tone of the papal letter does not appear. It remained in the record, however, for future reference.

In Bavaria Odilo, the new and energetic duke, uncle of

Karl's favorite Sunachild, who was herself friendy to Boniface, was well disposed to take up the proposals of 716 and try ecclestiastical reorganization on Roman lines while safe-guarding such state rights as had been successfully asserted by the Frankish princes. Odilo had invited the cooperation of Boniface even before he recrossed the Alps. Vivilo of Passau was then the only bishop in Bavaria who had Roman consecration. The management of ecclesiastical affairs was mainly in the hands of the great abbots who either acted as bishops or had *chorepiscopi* under them, as had been the custom in Scotic monasteries. The records are obscure but it is clear that the conditions were not making for orderly progress or even safeguarding the Church from corruption of dogma and of discipline. Boniface, with the active aid of the duke and the assent of the nobles, consecrated Bishops for Salzburg, Freising and Regensburg, which were, beside Passau, the chief cities of the region and already centres of civil administration. No provision seems to have been made for an archbishop and Boniface seems never to have acted in such a capacity. He gave his counsel, consecrated the necessary bishops, set reformatory visitations at work and passed on. In Bavaria the change was attended, as cause or as effect, by a general religious revival manifesting itself especially in monastic foundations. There was a strong opposition party however. Wigo, the abbot-bishop of St. Emmeran, claimed and seems to have exercised episcopal functions till his death in 756. Sidonius in Passau and Virgilius in Strassburg also maintained a measure of independence.

Content with Boniface's action in Bavaria Gregory recurred to his project of a joint Bavarian and Alamanian synod, exhorting the archbishop, who would have fain accorded his threescore years some repose, to renewed effort. Boniface did not see the way clear, however, and soon his thoughts were altogether engaged in another quarter. Karlman, elder son of Karl, had been charged by the aging and war-worn majordomo with the administration of the part of the Frankish realm including Thuringia. Karlman was devoted to the Church. He had been educated in a cloister, as was his brother Pipin, and ended his

life in one. With his support Boniface could at last carry out the long deferred hierachical organization of Thuringia, with bishops at Würzburg, Buraburg (in Hesse, near Fritzlar, then Boniface's chief monastery) and possibly also Erfurt. The appointments were formally recognized by Karlman who also gave Würzburg the bulk of its endowment. None of the sees could have been established without the approval of Karl, who through all his administration had been wont to set up and put down bishops at will. Evidently then, Karl, never opposed to Boniface, was now ready to cooperate actively with him. Possibly with the years each had learned that he needed what the other alone could give to the realization of their several designs. Then, too, Karl had in 739 declined to assist the pope against the Lombards and may have wished to make a concession in this neutral field.

These things occupied Boniface till 742. Meantime Karl had died and Gregory had given place to the shrewd but rather narrow Italo-Greek Zacharias. The new bishops did not wait to seek a papal confirmation before sharing in the consecration in 741 of Willibald to be bishop at Eichstadt in the Nordgau, which war had just cut off from Bavaria, and they took part in a synod before the confirmation was received. For the Bavarian bishops and for Willibald papal confirmation seems never to have been asked, but in view of the ambitions of some Frankish bishops Boniface no doubt felt it a wise precaution for Thuringia. In fact, however, of the three Thuringian sees Würzburg alone survived him.

In 742 Boniface was certainly sixty-five, probably sixty-seven. He had more than fulfilled the expectation with which he had been sent to Germany. He seems once more to have aspired to repose. But the hardest of all his tasks and perhaps the most fruitful of all his labors yet awaited him, the regeneration of the Church of the Gauls, the central district of the Frank kingdom. It came about in this way. Boniface had selected a successor, as Gregory III had authorized him to do. But the brother of this unnamed ecclesiastic had killed a relative of Karlman and was *persona non grata* at court. While Boniface

was considering what course he should take Zacharias cut the knot by cancelling in effect the liberty accorded by Gregory. He may have felt that it would be a troublesome precedent, the more as it seems reasonable to suppose that the Karlings were already cultivating the closer relations with the papacy that were to be so fateful for both. The letters of Boniface suggest a rather bitter disappointment, but it was for good.

Early in 742 Karlman, gratified with the results in Thuringia, summoned Boniface to his court and asked him to hold a synod for Austrasia, the part of the realm that he was administering, saying that he wished "somewhat to correct and amend" ecclesiastical conditions which had suffered much (*calcata et dissipata* are his words) during the last sixty or seventy years. The initiative, then, came from Karlman. A door was opened to Boniface revealing a prospect that might well make him young again.

What was the state of the Church in Austrasia in 742? If we take literally the words of the Letters and the Lives, the Frankish clergy must have been as a rule licentious brawlers and the better among them carousers, hunters, soldiers. Some, in fact, had all these traits. For two centuries conditions in Austrasia had favored neither learning nor cloistered piety. These were times in which national self-preservation had demanded constant wars and repeated conquests calling for the mobilization of all the forces of the state. A quarter, some say a third, of the arable land was Church domain. Karl had not scrupled to buy and to reward military service with the revenues of bishoprics and abbacies. Marriage of the clergy was almost the rule and sees had sometimes passed from father to son,— where both were good soldiers. Of course the dioceses suffered and the parishes no less. In the monasteries and nunneries discipline, never of Benedictine strictness, survived with difficulty or not at all. The common people, neglected by their appointed ministers, lent ready ear to irresponsible preachers, often Scotic monks or their pupils, some honest enthusiasts, some apparently charlatans. Of course there were survivals and revivals of heathen practices. What we have to keep in mind is that most

of these abuses were the inevitable result of political conditions and that, as these grew stable, the civil administration, claiming authority, recognized a corresponding responsibility. It took the initiative in remedying evils, so far as it thought this prudent in the national interest. The measure of success that these efforts met, in spite of the desperate and concerted resistance of those whose license was restrained and still more of those whose financial interests were affected, is evidence that the Karlings had the situation well in hand. The policy of Martel, of Karlman and of Pipin was essentially that of Charlemagne.

Boniface knew what forces he was facing and what were behind him. He sent an earnest, even anxious, appeal to Zacharias for unswerving support. Possibly he had doubts of the steadfastness of Karlman. Then, too, some Frankish clerics were meeting him with alleged dispensations from Rome. Zacharias delayed his reply and left the responsibility with the legate. There was the potentiality of a rebellion of Karlman's half-brother Grifo, aided by his great-uncle Odilo of Bavaria, to be reckoned with, and there are, besides, signs that the curia was disposed to see no more than it must where the support of influential Franks was at stake, a position that finds explanation and excuse in the increasing pressure of Lombard aggression. Primarily the task of Boniface and the aim of Karlman was not to change the relation of the Frankish Church to Rome but to reform it according to catholic canons and give it an efficient organization on Roman lines. The change in organization did indeed result in a change of status but that it necessarily implied this could not yet be clear. Every step that was taken, every decree that was issued was by the will and expressly in the name of the majordomo. In this field it was only in co-operation with the civil power that Boniface had succeeded, or, as he himself had said, could succeed.

Karlman convoked a synod, "to counsel me" he says, in April, 742. It was the first in 80 years in Austrasia. Laymen took part and apparently it was held, as were those that followed, in connection with the annual council of the realm. So far as appears it was Karlman's idea to have a reformed and

well organized Church in Austrasia of which he, rather than the legate, should be head. It was to re-establish old rules and institutions that had fallen into abeyance that the synod was called. Bavarian and Alamanian bishops (except possibly Pirmin's pupil Heddo of Strassburg) and some of the grosser offenders such as Milo of Treves and Gewilib of Mayence were conspicuous by absence. So there was little opposition to radical action. This Karlman embodied in a series of edicts on parochial subordination, heathen practices, celibacy, the Benedictine Rule and other matters. He also constituted Boniface (*missus S. Petri*) as metropolitan, though of the relation of the Austrasian Church to the curia there is not a word. Boniface presided at the synod by Karlman's appointment, not as legate, and it is to be noted that Karlman never recognized Boniface as archbishop by any other appointment than his own. He claimed the Thuringian appointments as his also. The decrees authorize the bishops to call on civil officers to enforce discipline. They forbid foreign bishops or priests to act without examination and approval by the synod. A declaration is made that alienated (*fraudatas*) church estates have been restored. Just what this means has been matter of much controversy, for elsewhere provision is made for the retention of Church property by those to whom it has been granted " in time of war and persecution " on payment of a fair annual rent. The subject often recurred but full restitution was impracticable. It was undesirable even from an enlightened ecclesiastical point of view and was in fact never made. There is no record that the pope was informed of the synod officially. It had not been called according to his instructions. Its immediate effect was to strengthen the Frankish Church, not the Roman. Five vacant sees were filled, yet the decrees met with great resistance, ecclesiastical and popular, as Boniface sadly notes in letters to English friends, and Karlman's half-brother Grifo sought to make them an occasion of civil war. Karlman knew what measure of reform the country would support and kept the movement within narrower bounds than Boniface hoped, yet much scope was left him, and, though Karlman was preoccupied with war, the legate, backed by the

civil arm, accomplished much good, though not without great vexation from "false priests and hypocrites," as appears from the letters.

In 743 a second synod, also with laymen, emphasized and extended the disciplinary provisions of 742 and prudently relaxed those about restoring Church property. Here the State shows great regard for the Church but guards jealously its overlordship and asserts the right to resume what it grants in case of need at its discretion. Again there is no mention of the curia, which had chosen this time to enter into the plans of Odilo of Bavaria against the Karlings. The pope, acquiescing in Odilo's plan for an independent Bavarian Church, had, it was claimed, ordained a Bavarian bishop and had sent a certain Sergius as legate there. This legate presently commanded Karlman, in the name of the pope, to keep the peace, but without effect on the campaign which ended in Odilo's complete subjugation. The affair might well have led to a break between Pipin, then sole majordomo, and the curia, but each still needed the other and the pope disavowed Sergius as he did also the Bavarian bishop. It is certain, however, that these synods changed nothing in the relation, whatever it had been, between Rome and the Frankish Church. Boniface was not altogether satisfied, but, two years later, the pope writes to him that he should rejoice to have recovered so much Church revenue as he had done. From a letter of 751, however, it appears that it had been easier to get the tax voted than it was to collect it.

In discipline the struggle now came to a head around a Scot, Clemens, whom Boniface thought a heretic and who proved so rebellious to discipline that he was presently deposed and imprisoned. A vast deal has been conjectured of him, but hardly anything is known, except *ex parte* through his very zealous and embittered opponent.

Pipin, Karlman's far-sighted brother, administrator of the Neustrian part of the kingdom, now saw in the effect of the Austrasian synods much promise of direct good and also of service to his still concealed designs on the Merwing throne. He invited Boniface to consecrate in the summer of 743 three arch-

bishops for Neustria. The pope was asked by the Karlings and Boniface for three pallia, yet not, it would seem, for a confirmation of the synod's choice, as Zacharias in his answer assumes. Then came an unexplained change of plan. Only one pallium was wanted and that not eagerly. It was for Grimo of Rouen who did not feel he needed it. Abel of Rheims and Hartbert of Sens demurred, it would seem, at the cost or had, perhaps, in some way forfeited the support of Pipin. Neither Rouen nor Rheims remained metropolitan. We find the pope indignantly deprecating charges of simony that Boniface had communicated to him. No pallia were received and the archbishops acted without them. This disturbed Zacharias on account of the precedent. He repeatedly recurs to the matter in letters urging Boniface to persuade the archbishops to take them, but up to 751 they had not done so. That the pope was vexed with the legate and he with the curia is plain. It is also plain that Pipin was not eager for the metropolitan system. He regarded himself as administrative head of the Church in his realm, even to the extent of imposing on bishops and abbots civic duties and functions.

Pipin also invited Boniface to aid with his counsel at a synod, summoned in connection with the annual council at Soissons, March, 744. It is doubtful if Boniface was present or that he ever acted officially in Neustria. Twenty-three bishops joined in the synod's acts which extended beyond the distinctively religious sphere to such matters as fixing standard weights and measures for the markets. The decrees were similar to the Austrasian except that much more attention was given to the reform of social conditions. In regard to military service it was provided that holders of benefices, though themselves exempt, should furnish soldiers from their vassals.

The synod apparently affected much good, but, as in Austrasia, there was strong popular resistance to change, centering around a certain Adalbert, a Frank, who takes here much the same place that Clemens had in Karlman's region. A vast deal has been written of him, now as a holy prophet, now as a deliberate charlatan. He was, probably, a self-deceiver, a neurotic enthusiast.

The synod condemned him and he was for a time imprisoned, but the populace, abetted no doubt by those whose private interests had been affected by the synodal decrees, showed such a threatening front that he was freed, possibly by force, and Boniface in 745 appealed for support and counsel to Rome. The pope welcomed the occasion to act as judge of final appeal and, to emphasize the significance of his action, called a synod which with much ceremonial deposed, unheard and undefended, both Adalbert and Clemens from their ministry, excommunicated Clemens and threatened Adalbert with excommunication. The pope thought this would be welcome news to Boniface, but we are expressly told that it was a surprise, perhaps no pleasant one. Certainly it did not make his position easier with Pipin, who preferred to conduct his own negotiations, especially those with the curia. Echoes of the papal condemnation were too faint to be heard in Neustria, where we find both Adalbert and Clemens so far active in 746 that Zacharias advises Boniface to bring the matter once more before a local council. He added that if the disturbers proved recalcitrant they might be sent to Rome for judgment, but that would hardly have met the views of Pipin. Nothing came of it. Of Clemens we lose sight; Adalbert, his enemies said, was some time later killed, as a fugitive, by swineherds, but for centuries he was held among the people in wondering memory. The records in this case are of peculiar interest. They afford an unusually clear example of how in curial diplomacy persistent assumption of initiative and command, in quarters where these would not have been formally admitted, prepared the way in the fulness of time for actual recognition. In Hildebrand's day these records were read in a light quite different from that in which they appeared to contemporaries. The immediate effect of the synods was to strengthen the national Church and the social order. Ultimately they became a very important factor in strengthening papal authority, but that belongs to the story of quite other rulers and churchmen than Boniface, Zacharias or Pipin.

After the Neustrian synod Boniface went to Fulda to lay the foundations of a cloister that he designed for his old age and

final resting place. Much of this year was spent in a general visitation of churches in Thuringia and in Bavaria where he was not altogether welcome. His jurisdiction was called in question, and sustained by the pope on his appeal. The next year saw the summoning of the first general Frankish synod jointly by Pipin and Karlman. Boniface presided and was warmly congratulated by the pope on the results, which tended to unify and strengthen discipline and to facilitate its enforcement even in the case of so energetic and powerful a man as Bishop Gewilib of Mayence, whose warlike deeds were later to find epic commemoration. For a moment Gewielib contemplated an appeal to Rome but was, it would seem, persuaded to resign his see and lived for fourteen years in honorable retirement. But opposition was by no means dead or disorganized. It was even able to make head against the plan to give Boniface Cologne as his archiepiscopal see. The pope, at the majordomo's request, had given formal assent, but, possibly after Karlman's retirement, Pipin changed his mind. Cologne was given to one Agilolf. The name is that of the Bavarian ducal family and the appointment may well have had a political motive. Boniface, under what conditions is not clear, took in 748, evidently at Pipin's behest, the distinctively Frankish Mayence as his archiepiscopal, though not metropolitan see.

This is the climax of Boniface's career. A septuagenarian he takes his place in the hierarchical order he had himself brought into being, an archbishop among archbishops, an aging man, looking steadfastly but not without longing for the end. Each year he now spent much time at Fulda for which he got a special papal charter of exemption from all but papal control, if, indeed, the document, purporting to be of 751, is unaltered and genuine. Such grants were not uncommon in Italy and England but there had been none such till then in the Frank kingdom. Pipin did not approve the grant till 753, when the concession was a makeweight in his larger statecraft.

As he had strength Boniface continued to travel in the interest of reform and so fell into an unfortunate controversy with Sidonius of Passau and a Scot, Virgilius of Salzburg, who seems to have been Pipin's unofficial representative in Bavaria since

the defeat of Odilo and a man of considerable intellectual independence. He even speculated on the plurality of worlds and the antipodes. For this the pope condemned him, though without apparent effect as he was later duly consecrated bishop. The pope had supported him however in an appeal against the contention of Boniface that grammatical errors in the baptismal formula would invalidate the sacrament. Toward Sidonius the pope counselled Boniface to use more patience. The letters from now on begin to show some discouragement, excusable in old age, the more so as conditions were still unsatisfactory. He finds among the clergy runaway slaves, men who elude all episcopal supervision, field-preachers, grotesquely ignorant, confusing Christian and heathen rites. All this was, no doubt, inevitable. The hierarchy could be changed more rapidly than the rural clergy or the people. But he was grieved. He consoled himself with study and extended his English correspondence.

The last synod at which Boniface presided seems to have been held, separately from the assembly of notables, at Duria in 747. There is no evidence that the majordomos were present or that they promulgated its decrees. This synod, as Boniface tells Archbishop Cuthbert of Canterbury, solemnly professed " to the body of Peter, chief of the Apostles " the unity of the Catholic faith and their subordination to " St. Peter and his vicar." These phrases were usual in synodal addresses and that no change in the relations to the papacy was intended appears from the terms in which Zacharias acknowledged the receipt of their profession. Of course it was " joyfully accepted." The synod also resolved to ask pallia for their archbishops, to meet annually and to take steps to regulate and improve parochial and monastic organization, probably on lines suggested in answers of Zacharias to Pipin's queries. The synod, however, seems to have conceived papal power as subject to limitations not in accord with a literal construction of the curial acknowledgment. In their minds papal intervention was to be invited on occasion, not to be looked for habitually or unasked. The Roman Church was to declare apostolic tradition if appealed to rather than to speak of itself. There is no explicit statement by Boniface of his own

position but his acts accord best with such a view. Many of the resolutions of 747 remained in abeyance, probably because they lacked legal sanction. Up to 751, at least, no pallia had been sought by the Neustrian archbishops; relations with the curia remained in the hands of the majordomos and as appears from the acts of the synod of 755 Boniface died with the archiepiscopal organization still incomplete, though the way to a provincial constitution of the Church had been plainly shown.

It was probably about this time that Boniface was given Mayence, though he did not receive a papal confirmation for the see till 751. Even then it was, so far as appears, unsought. Curiously enough while the pope here places in his jurisdiction Lüttich, Cologne, Worms, Spires and Utrecht, Boniface in writing to Pope Stephen, not earlier than 752, of negotiations with Cologne about Utrecht, appeals not to this document but to a decree of Karlman. The appointment seems to have been not altogether welcome. He would have preferred " because of age and weakness " to turn over the whole archidiocesan administration to a *chorepiscopus*. Against this Zacharias counselled strongly, but he did not forbid it, and Boniface, after about a year, decided to follow his own bent rather than the pope's *consilium*. In the five years since the first synod papal prestige had very greatly increased in the Frank realm but as yet there had been very little change in the recognition of a direct papal authority.

Growing dissatisfaction with conditions at court and in the Frankish Church now begins to mark the correspondence. Boniface is dissatisfied, too, with himself. He was probably suffering from illness for we lose sight of him altogether in 749 and 750, and in 751 Zacharias' reply to a valetudinarian letter expresses joy that Boniface is still alive. Meantime Pipin had been preparing the *coup d'état* that was to dethrone Childeric III and make the actual ruler king in name as well. To secure for his act a moral justification to match the political, Pipin naturally turned to Rome whose judgment Western Europe united in regarding as the highest moral sanction. Cautious negotiations with the curia had by 750 or 751 reached a point where Pipin

could send Abbot Fulrad of St. Denis and Bishop Burchard of Würzburg to Rome with a definite question assured of a favorable answer. At an assembly in Soissons in 751 Pipin took the crown. He was also anointed, with consequences far-reaching for Europe for centuries. What part had Boniface in this? The earliest records imply, none. It is not till the time of Charlemagne that anyone says he anointed the king, as he would naturally have done if asked, and it is a fair inference that he was not at Soissons because he was too ill to be there. Moreover had the legate performed the act the pope would hardly have discredited his own representative by repeating it in 754. In what had gone before there had been no occasion for his intervention. The *secreta quaedam* which Lul took from him to Zacharias in 751 had, as is clear from the pope's answer, nothing to do with politics, from which indeed Boniface always kept aloof. That Pipin and the pope should make common cause was too obviously in the interest of both to need his mediation. The pope wanted political independence from the Byzantine emperors and defence against Aistulf and the Lombards. Nobody but Pipin could give this, and he could give it more effectively as king. Why look for Boniface's hand here?

Early in 752 Zacharias died. Stephen II succeeded him. Zacharias had been primarily a Churchman, Stephen was an ecclesiastical politician. Boniface wrote to him, as seems probable, soon after his accession. There is no trace of an answer nor of a meeting between them during the six months that Stephen passed at the court of Pipin, his refuge from Lombard aggression. Boniface's letters to the new pope show no swerving in loyalty attested by long service. He speaks of thirty-six years, going back in memory to his first visit to Frisia. He has been busy, he says, in restoring churches of which some thirty had been destroyed probably by the Saxon raids of 751. There is a legend that he visited about this time St. Pirmin at Hornbach. From Mayence he writes to Abbot Fulrad, "It seems that I must soon finish my course," and he wishes that the king might be moved to make provision for his mission helpers, "almost all foreigners," some priests scattered over the coun-

tryside, some monks and nuns and some *infantes ad legendas litteras ordinati,* which seems to mean children committed to the cloisters for education. At the same time he asks Pipin to appoint (*componere*) Lul, his suffragan since 752, his successor at Mayence, and emphasizes the daily needs of his frontier missionaries. Later he thanks Pipin for " comforting his age and weakness " and hopes he is so far recovered as " to be of further service to the king." He may have thought he had still strength to inaugurate on the Frisian frontier a work of reorganization and reform. In any case events presently turned his thoughts northward. The see of Utrecht was vacant in May, 753. Cologne had advanced a claim to it and Boniface would not be behind. In the spring of 753 Lul was formally appointed Bishop of Mayence. In June, " with the assent of Pipin," as we are expressly told in the Life of Abbot Sturm, Boniface started down the Rhine, taking formal farewell of friends from far and near and bearing with him a shroud. The winter of 753–4 was spent in Utrecht. In the spring, either not yet hearing or hearing too late of Stephen's coming to Pipin, which was in January, he went again to Frisia where Radbod II was reasserting independence and favoring pagan reaction. Here on June 5 he met his death at pagan hands, his sole defence, as a woman eyewitness told, a book of the Gospels.[1]

Chrodegang of Metz succeeded Boniface in his archiepiscopal functions. The legation, being personal, ceased with him. A curious story was told in the eleventh century of Chrodegang's promotion, which is significant though it can hardly be true. Chrodegang was for many reasons *persona grata* to Stephen. In 753 he had helped him in negotiations with the Lombards and had escorted him in the following winter to the court of Pipin who received him in honorable state and presently avenged him on the Lombards, with momentous consequences both to papacy and empire. The story is that when the pope undertook to make Chrodegang bishop, which he had been for years before 754, Boniface " withstood him to his face, saying that it was not

[1] The year is disputed but there are several legal documents of June and July, 754, that note or assume his death, the latest also his burial at Fulda.

lawful for him to go beyond the bounds of his see and without the consent of the bishop to whose diocese the place, whatever it is, belongs [in this case, Treves] to consecrate anyone bishop."[1] The pope, according to the narrative, rested on his "apostolic authority." Pipin is said to have reconciled them by an appeal to the proprieties, with no attempt to enter on the merits of the question. Here is evidence at least of what some in the eleventh century thought Boniface would have done had encroachment been attempted on his archiepiscopal jurisdiction. Its assumption is that the pope is head of the church, but not master, that his function is not to command but to represent.

Not without forebodings Boniface went to an end unsought, yet not unwelcome. Premonitions of death can be seen in his letters and his acts. As has been said, he took with him a shroud, and gave Lul instructions for his burial. "I saw him grey and weak with age," writes Gregory of Utrecht, as he returned to the field of his first conquests for the Cross in the days which he now recalled perhaps with the most unalloyed satisfaction. His greater work of organization and reform had been attended with continual vexations. The fruit of his labors matured too slowly for the impatience of his old age. It was all too plain to him that his work in Austrasia and even in Thuringia was passing to younger and other hands. The leaders of the coming generation would be the Chrodegangs and Fulrads, not the men of his training and tradition. One last gift he had for the Church, a martyr's death. By this he set up a standard and made his name a rallying cry, with fortune in so far happier than that of Theodore, his exemplar.

Loyalty was the dominant trait in Boniface's character, loyalty to friends, to country, above all to his vows as missionary representative of the Church in what seemed to him its supreme expression, the successors of Peter. There was something peculiarly personal in his feeling. He had taken an oath, he was the scrupulously conscientious vassal of an over-lord. But he showed an equal loyalty to the majordomos, so that he would not even seek to carry out a Roman plan of organization without

[1] Monumenta Moguntina, p. 478.

regard to their wishes and rights. He had learned by experience that only through the civil power could reforms be either initiated or maintained. To this extent his work tended to state-establishment. The spring of his allegiance to Rome is to be sought less in any dogma than in a sense of gratitude for the help that had come to him from the papal commission and from the prestige of the Roman name, and still more in the conviction that the established order of the Roman Church must interpenetrate Germanism if its untutored strength was to be disciplined for civilization. Boniface was not a great originator but pre-eminently a child of his time. His talent lay in organization, in winning loyalty by loyalty, in doggedly persistent, yet intelligent service of the ideals of his age and nation, of the papacy and the Karlings. And yet between Gregory I and Gregory VII it is hard to name a Churchman more significant in achievement than he. *Benjamin W. Wells.*

The Scope or Field of Episcopal Jurisdiction

AN intelligent Englishman, a member of the Church of England, sojourning in this country, not long ago propounded to the writer the following question, viz:

Assuming that in a given area there can be only one organization authoritatively representing the Catholic Church, it follows that any other Christian organization within the same area must be at least schismatical, even if not heretical, and as such to be avoided by good Catholics. In cases where there are two or more organizations in the same area, each claiming to be a part of the Catholic Church, by what criterion are their claims to be judged? Must not lawful claim to jurisdiction be based on either purity of doctrine, or priority of settlement in the district?

This inquiry, made by a man who was evidently troubled with religious scruples about his position in a city where there were

at least three Christian organizations, each of which was governed by a bishop and professed to represent the Catholic Church, prompted the writing of the following article, for which also an editorial that appeared a few years ago in *The Church Times* (London) has supplied several suggestions.

At the outset it is to be noted that the assumption that there can be but one Catholic Christian organization in any city or diocese is not historically true. Normally, indeed, there would be but one; yet abnormal conditions such as caused a breach of the rule have existed in past ages and abound at the present day. The question of the relation of Christian people to this or that bishop is a question of jurisdiction; and the question here examined is the necessity of that method by which a bishop's jurisdiction is limited by territorial bounds within which no other ordinary Episcopal jurisdiction may lawfully be exercised.

By Episcopal jurisdiction we mean the power or right of exercising authority or rule in the Church of God. Christ gave to the Apostles authority and power to rule and govern his Church; and it is an historical fact that the said apostolical power and authority have been handed on continuously, through all the ages, solely by men whose office and rank in the Church has been that which we term Episcopal. Whether he exercise them or not, every bishop, by virtue of his ordination and consecration to the Episcopate, possesses the *power of order,* namely, the power of ordaining men to the sacred ministry, and the *power of jurisdiction.* The power of order belongs solely to the Episcopate; and no one save a bishop, or a bishop's deputy, can exercise that fullness of jurisdictional authority which is vested in the Episcopate. To a limited extent the jurisdictional power of the bishop is imparted by him to the priest to whom he commits the immediate cure of some Christian people; and by virtue of this authority the parish priest is a constituent member of the diocesan synod; but the bishop is ever the chief pastor, and bishops alone are the constituent members of provincial and general councils.

The power of rule possessed by bishops and exercised by a bishop in the place to which he has lawfully been sent is the authority of the whole Episcopate, of which each bishop has an individual share. A bishop exercises the authority of all the bishops only as he rules in agreement with the common judgment of the whole Episcopate: He cannot lawfully exercise jurisdictional power as if it were his own, nor can he lawfully impose any ruling which is against the common law of the Church of God.

The jurisdictional power of a bishop is necessarily exercised in some place, but not necessarily to the exclusion of exercise of similar power within the same region. We deem it needless here to discuss and refute the papal contention that the bishop of Rome possesses by divine right "absolute and universal jurisdiction, no person, region, or ecclesiastical matter, excepted;" and that all other bishops exercise their jurisdictional power only as subject to papal authority. That contention has been most ably and conclusively refuted by many authors, notably by Father Denny in his exhaustive treatise on *Papalism.* The statement that the exercise of ecclesiastical jurisdiction does not necessarily involve an exclusion of exercise of similar powers within the same region, conflicts with a principle that for many centuries was widely believed to be essential to the well-being of the Church; namely, that each bishop exercising jurisdiction should be locally separated from other bishops exercising jurisdiction, and that each of such bishops should have his own place within the limits of which no other bishop should attempt to rule. Able authors have asserted or assumed, that from the outset each bishop exercised his jurisdictional power over all Christian people who dwelt within that certain area or territorial limit which had been allotted to him; and that, within such limits, no other bishop could lawfully rule, save as in the exercise of the authority which such other bishop held *in solidum,* or joint-tenure with his fellow-bishops.

Nevertheless it does not appear to be certain that Episcopal jurisdiction was at once and everywhere exercised on the basis

of local separation. There is, however, abundant evidence that by the fourth century the territorial system had become so thoroughly established that it was usually regarded as a necessary feature of Church-order. The final clause of the eighth canon of the Council of Nicaea (A. D. 325), namely, "that there may not be two bishops in one city," recognizes the principle of local separation; but it is to be noted, as Dr. Bright has pointed out, that "the principle is not so much enforced as assumed by the Council." So strongly did this principle take hold of men's minds that, early in the year 357, when the Emperor Constantine's edict was read, proclaiming liberty to Liberius, the exiled bishop of Rome, to return to the city on condition that he should rule jointly with Felix (who had been uncanonically consecrated and put in Liberius' place), the Roman people assembled in the circus cried out, in scornful indignation, "One God, One Christ, One Bishop!"

The custom of having but one bishop exercising jurisdiction in one district, whether that district were large or small, had for its purpose the preservation of unity. As vicars of Christ the bishops represent Christ and the unity in Christ. Saint Ignatius, of Antioch, says, "As many as are of God and Jesus Christ, they are with the bishop." And Saint Cyprian says, "They are the Church who are a people united to the bishop. . . . The bishop is in the Church, and the Church is in the bishop; and if any be not with the bishop, he is not in the Church." As representing the unity of the Church, and constituted as the official agent for the preservation of unity in the Church, a bishop must have no rival. Such, then, was the ideal, and such was the usual practice, that bishops exercising jurisdiction should be locally separated, and each be supreme in his own district. There might indeed be many auxiliary bishops, or "country-bishops," performing certain episcopal functions, within a single district; yet normally but one bishop exercising jurisdictional power in that district.

Nevertheless it must be maintained that the presence of two or more bishops ruling within the same territory does not necessarily oppose any essential principle of the Christian

Church. In past ages there have been exceptions to the rule of local separation, and there are notable exceptions at the present day. For example, there is the theory that in the early ages there existed occasionally, for a time, in the same city, two bishops, one of whom presided over Gentile converts and the other over Christians of the Jewish race. We cannot prove this, but it explains, as nothing else does, certain inconsistent accounts. Euodias and Ignatius are thought to have occupied jointly the see of Antioch, each exercising a racial rather than a territorial jurisdiction, until the death of Euodias; after which Ignatius succeeded in bringing both sections under his own rule. It is possible that Saint Peter and Saint Paul may have ruled jointly in like manner in the see of Rome. In Alexandria there appears to have been, for a time, some sort of collegiate government rather than that of a monarchical or diocesan episcopacy. In the latter half of the fourth century at one time there were four bishops in the city of Antioch, each exercising jurisdiction over his own flock; namely, Saint Meletius and Paulinus, each of whom held the orthodox faith; Euzoius, an Arian; and Vitalis, an Apollinarian. The critical comment that one alone had the right to exercise jurisdiction involves not only some satisfactory answer to the question, which bishop possessed that sole right, but also the making due allowance for the fact that the flock of the banished Eustathius over which, after thirty years had passed, Paulinus (a priest of the said Eusthathians) was consecrated bishop, had a status in their recognition by Saint Athanasius and the West generally; and furthermore, that the said Eustathians and the people who adhered to Meletius lived apart peaceably, awaiting a settlement of their difficulties, until the breach was widened by the uplifting of Paulinus to the episcopate. In this connection it is to be remembered that, according to a credible account, Saint Meletius shortly before his death entered into an agreement with Paulinus, whereby it was stipulated that " so far as they could bring it about, whenever either of them should be removed by death, the survivor should be regarded as the sole bishop of Antioch."

The Celtic Church in Ireland does not appear to have had a diocesan episcopacy until the eleventh century; nor did such method of episcopal jurisdiction obtain in Scotland until after the middle of the same century, for until the year 1057, as Collier tells us, "all the Scottish bishops had their jurisdiction as it were at large, and exercised their functions wherever they came." That so large a portion of the Church was able to maintain its integrity during many centuries without the jurisdictional limitations which for the most part were common elsewhere, seems to be fair evidence that the method of limiting the jurisdiction of a bishop to a given area, within which no other bishop may lawfully bear rule, is not essential.

The Syrian Maronites who submitted themselves to the see of Rome towards the close of the twelfth century, were not required to accept the rule of the Latin bishop of Antioch but were allowed to retain their own chief pastor, their vernacular liturgy, and many of their racial customs. The title of the Uniat Maronite mass-book at the present day is *Missale Chaldaicum juxta Ecclesiae Nationis Maronitarum.* A similar practice has been followed by Roman authorities in their dealings with most, if not all, of the Uniat churches; and with their accustomed practical wisdom the said authorities provide, as the canonist Bouix declares, that while normally there may not be more than one bishop exercising jurisdiction in the same city or diocese, an exception is allowed to bishops who, independently of each other, care for and govern people of diverse rites and languages who dwell in the same ecclesiastical territory. Theoretically it might be claimed that the separated and independent bodies dwelling in the midst of the ancient Orthodox patriarchates have no lawful status; yet practically and in fact, they have a perfectly reasonable and valid existence as ecclesiastical dioceses not of the territorial kind but of races and rites. An intensified form of such racial and ritual basis of ecclesiastical rule is to be found in the various bodies of Christians resident in Jerusalem and its vicinity.

Some of us, certainly not a few of our brethren in England, have been wont to use the words, "The Italian Mission," to

designate the Latin hierarchy and its flocks in England; thereby implying that their status is uncanonical and schismatical. But surely the conduct of the people who have consistently and continually resisted the religious changes of the sixteenth century in England has not been altogether unreasonable. It is to be remembered that among the people to whom clergy of the Latin rite minister in England, not a few are folk of foreign birth who were brought up in the Latin Communion. Must they, because they have made their home temporarily or permanently in England, be deprived of the ministrations of that part of the Church in which they were brought up and to which they rightly belong? Again, take the case of people of our own Communion who may sojourn on the Continent for a long time. Must they, because the Roman Church excludes them from sacramental ministrations, be deprived for the time of all pastoral care? To set up altars needlessly and to foment divisions, is certainly sinful; but where care is taken to avoid these grave errors place may rightly be found for the ministrations of their own clergy among Christians of any rite or race wherever they may dwell. The division of mankind into various races with diverse languages is of God's own ordering. The diversity of Christian rites or liturgical forms, according to the racial characteristics of the people for whose use they were intended, may also be regarded as providential, and as indicative of God's will concerning the manner in which, at least normally, the Christian people of the several races or nations should worship Him. This was true when there was no breach in the fellowship of Catholic Christians throughout the world; and much more must it be true now that intercommunion no longer exists. Under existing conditions it is plain that each Catholic Communion is under obligation to minister to its members as far as possible, wherever they may dwell; and that Catholic Christian people are under obligation to adhere to that Communion to which, by racial and liturgical associations, they properly belong.

Lastly, and of more immediate concern to us, is the fact that while the territorial system is nominally in force in this

country, the limitations of ecclesiastical jurisdiction are not territorial but racial and ritual. Roman bishops, despite the papal claim to universal jurisdiction, are here compelled to allow to the bishops of other Churches the freedom that they themselves have to govern and minister to people who are willing to accept their ministrations. The Orthodox Eastern Church, according to its own theory, is the only true Church in the world; but here it cannot exclude the bishops of any other religious body from the exercise of jurisdiction over their own people in the territory in which the Orthodox Eastern bishops have established themselves. So far as territory is concerned, there is but one restraint and that is common to all bishops, viz: that those who are of the same rite may not lawfully exercise jurisdiction beyond their own diocesan limits. Greek, Syrian, Latin, and Anglican bishops may, and sometimes do, here occupy the same territory, not necessarily as rivals but independently of each other, each looking after his own flock and not interfering with his episcopal brethren of other rites.

Neither priority of settlement, nor the language that is most commonly in use here, nor the distinctively English character of the laws of the land, nor any claim of purity in doctrine here suffices to make good any claim of exclusive ecclesiastical jurisdiction. "Can any one say," asks Dr. Figgis, "that the old territorial doctrine of the Church holds in the United States of America; and that an Italian, an Englishman, a Greek, and an Armenian Christian, who arrived with their families in New York, are bound as a matter of course to join the American Episcopal Church, and to bring up their children therein?" Whatever may still be the case elsewhere, in this country, anyhow, it is no longer the geographical area in which people dwell that determines their ecclesiastical obedience, but their racial and ritual associations and their own personal convictions.

To some extent similar conditions exist in various quarters in Europe and Asia where Christian people of different nations and diverse rites are congregating in ever increasing numbers.

The bare statement of such a state of affairs seems to point to confusion, disorder, and utter loss of ecclesiastical unity; yet such need not be the consequences. Our ideas of unity and order are more or less colored and shaped by the usual and normal conditions of ecclesiastical organization in past ages. Those conditions may seem to us to be ideal but we cannot reproduce them. Amendments and improvements in jurisdictional methods are possible, but the changes must look forward and not backward; essentials must be retained, but non-essentials however much they may be revered by reason of age-long or immemorial use may be cast aside.

In the ages when as yet there was no breach of fellowship between the several and various Churches of Catholic Christendom, bishops exercising jurisdiction were, as a rule, separated locally. Now, more and more frequently, they are found dwelling together, yet, alas, not as brethren. Nevertheless, may not this dwelling together be God's own providential means of bringing about a mutual recognition, on the part of the said bishops, of their brotherhood in Christ? May it not be that, more than anything else, more than all "Conferences on Faith and Order," conditions such as exist in this country and the congregating of people of many nations in great numbers here and there upon the face of the earth, will prove to be instrumental in bringing about intercommunion and practical fellowship among all who accept the fundamental principles of the Christian religion, and in breaking down efforts to lord it over God's heritage, and in fostering the unity and the peace which are according to God's will?

C. P. A. Burnett.

Let us serve God in the sunshine, while He makes the sun shine. We shall then serve Him all the better in the dark, when He sends the darkness. It is sure to come. Only let our light be God's light, and our darkness God's darkness, and we shall be safe at home when the great nightfall comes.

The Use and Abuse of Church History

IV. Constructive History

IN his work on *The Mystical Element in Religion* Von Huegel says, in effect, that Christianity may be summed up as consisting of three factors:—(1) the *institutional,* or Church side of things; (2) the *historical,* or intellectual sphere; (3) the *mystical* sphere, in which the souls of men have direct access to the life and love of God.

If the study of the history of the Church in its manifold bearing upon religion, personal and corporate, be omitted from the study of Christianity, the institutional and historical factors cannot be adequately grasped. If only the mystical sphere is investigated, the result is liable to be in effect a vague, subjective religion, where the individual experience alone is emphasized and the life of Jesus Christ as extended and worked out in His mystical Body, the Church, is placed in a subordinate position or ignored altogether. There is great significance in the wording of the clause about the Church in one of the early baptismal creeds—"Dost thou believe in *salvation through the Holy Catholic Church?*" And then by no means the majority of people have the mystical temper. Mystics, like poets, are born, not made. Mysticism is very much to the fore at the present time. Its three dangers have been stated as emotionalism, eclecticism and Christlessness. These can be counterbalanced and safeguarded by the study of the Church in its historical and developing life. The great mystics have been those who founded their union and life with God upon union and life within the Church, under the authority of Divine Revelation and in association with the Sacraments wherein He comes to men and abides with them.

The critical and controversial aspects of Christianity and its theology also absorb attention at the present moment, the former of scholars, the latter of the interested but unlearned. As has been emphasized in an earlier consideration of controversial history no positive good is likely to result.

The stress always needs to be laid on the constructive history and periods of the Christian Church. The edifice has been in process of erection according to a Divine plan for a good many centuries. It is easy enough to discover places where the workmanship is poor because the workmen have not followed the Architect's plan. That indicates incompetency on the part of those who have been given responsibility for performing or overseeing the work. It is not difficult to expose poor and unworthy material which tends to weaken the structure. Relative advantages in parts of the economic structure may be fair subjects for discussion possibly. But what of the building as a whole? Does it stand firmly? Has it endured the shocks and attacks of time and enemies? Is it still a shelter, a refuge, a stronghold? Has there ever been anything better? Has there ever been anything half so good?

Some interesting attempts have been made from time to time to deal with the history of the Church by beginning with the present and working back stage by stage to the Day of Pentecost. It is a fascinating experiment to make but really involves practical difficulties and a series of assumptions which are liable to obviate the very ends desired. In the first place the Church is a present fact and an institution that in essence and life is exactly the same as on the first day of its history. The analogy with a human body holds good here. The Church was complete on the Day of Pentecost, with all organs, powers, possessions and ideals that it now claims. Growth, extension, increased development of powers, fuller realization of adaptability to the needs of men are to be traced, as in the case of the human body. Certain abnormal conditions of the Christian world at the moment do not necessarily constitute valid premises for reasoning backward to the age before. In order to do that it is imperative to assume certain points which are not easy to establish without bringing in earlier history. For example, if one begins with the divided condition of Christendom at the present time, it is difficult to show that this condition must be wrong because the Church was intended to be One, without falling back upon earlier periods and the

documents of the New Testament that witness to the principle of unity and the evil of schism.

The Church, again, is a building and that building was complete eighteen centuries ago. The history of the Church is meant to show its capacity for being the Ark of salvation throughout the ages. Its history is not a narrative of continual human tinkering, of changing plans and architect and of tearing down the old from time to time in order to make way for the new. All men do not enter the building, all may not avail themselves of every privilege that the building provides, some individuals may leave the shelter of the edifice and set out to erect something better in their estimation. Some rooms in the structure may apparently be closed and disused. But the New Jerusalem came down from heaven as a bride adorned for her husband, perfect, beautiful, complete. The witness of history is the witness to that truth but it is exceedingly doubtful if the proof can be given by reading the narrative in the reverse direction, without some assumption of that which it is desired to establish.

What really can be done with considerable value by those who have traced the history of the Church in the world is to present something like a cross-section of the building where at a glance the various stages may be seen and the use or abuse of this or that portion of the structure at different periods of its existence, or to show how the building has been able to withstand attack. This is exceedingly valuable and not open to the same criticism as the proposal to write history backward.

Constructive history of the Church will begin properly with the place and time where and when "they were all with one accord in one place and suddenly there came a sound from heaven * * * and they were all filled with the Holy Ghost." It might be better to say *the constructive history of the course of the Church in human history.* There are preludes to this narrative, there was a period of preparation, there was a merging of certain elements of the old dispensation in the new. These are all important, but to the same extent as all transition periods are important. We are

now and have been since the descent of the Holy Spirit in the last period of God's dealing with the human race for redemption. "Last of all, He sent unto them His Son, saying, They will reverence My Son." The work of the Holy Ghost in the Church is to secure for men that abiding Presence. There never can be another Incarnation nor another Pentecost.

The frank admission is now made by some apologists for one or another of the older religious bodies in separation from the historic Church, that the early history of the separation has nothing to do with the particular body at the present time. A Methodist who is confronted with John Wesley's teaching on the Sacraments is very likely to reply that Methodists have cut loose from Wesleyanism, and this is generally true. The eighteenth century leader is now a revered name but not an authority. Presbyterianism has largely disowned John Calvin so far as constructive theology is concerned and as to polity the theory of a historical succession on one ministerial order — the presbyterate — from apostolic times has been abandoned. Congregationalism has ceased to connote any one of several bodies in particular and certain Unitarian bodies call themselves officially Congregationalist. Even the papal theory gains its strength largely from its present wide practical acceptance as a successful religious organization. Backing up papal claims from history has almost invariably been carried on by a method which is equally justifiable, so far as historical method is concerned, in case of other ecclesiastical theories. The Encyclical of Leo XIII is about as transparently unhistorical a document as any in the course of eighteen centuries.

The Constructive Method of dealing with the history of the Church is not popular. The "Efficiency Method" is plausible and attractive. It assumes that visible and tangible results are the true "fruits" of Christianity. The Controversial Method develops egotism and individualism on the less admirable side. These are all superficial and require little time and seldom result in "a permanent peace." The Constructive Method demands a good deal of effort and rigid restraint at many points from leaping to conclusions. Very few people will give

more than an hour to hearing about the Early Church or the Reformation period. One of my students approached me one day asking what *one book* he should read in preparation for a series of addresses on the history of the Early Church that he proposed to give to the people of the Mission where he acted as lay-reader. The advice that, for every hour of instruction he proposed to give, not less than twenty hours of reading in anticipation would be necessary (which was the lowest reasonable estimate), astonished him. I have heard of a parish priest who, wishing to give a talk on Church History to his congregation Sunday evening, sat down that afternoon with three elementary books to "get up" the material for a half hour's instruction. And on the other side the laity are equally at fault. It is next to impossible to secure the consecutive attendance of lay people at a series of even four or five instructions upon any subject or period in Church History or to read thoroughly and studiously a reliable and scholarly book on a historical subject which employs the scientific, historical method and quotes authorities and sources. It is discouraging in the extreme to find, as an experience common to all who would teach, that the more superficial acquaintance an individual has with a theological subject the more difficult it is to persuade him to acquire knowledge and to refrain from prejudiced and untenable statements. The constructive teacher is at a disadvantage in this respect. Nevertheless nothing secures the desired results except patient, thorough, thoughtful instruction.

Some suggestions will be given in this chapter to those who wish to pursue their studies in the history of the Christian Church on sound lines.

I. *Choice of Books and Historical Writers.*

No historical work should be selected to be read merely because of its conclusions. The point is to see how those conclusions have been reached and whether they are tenable on sound historical evidence. I have before me a copy of Abbot Gasquet's popular lectures delivered at St. Patrick's Cathedral, New York, in 1913, and published under the title — Breaking

with the Past. The writer, who can write history but was not imported for that purpose in the delivery of these lectures, has for his thesis to show that the Church in England abandoned in the sixteenth century the catholic doctrines of the Priesthood, the Sacraments and Church Authority. Having established, largely by unsupported statements, to the satisfaction of those who hold the thesis the points in question, Gasquet appends a list of "Books Suggested for Reading." The trustful reader who might reasonably expect a wide range of books of reference finds himself confronted with twenty-two titles, out of which fourteen are by Roman Catholic controversial writers, seven of them by Gasquet himself, while the few works by other writers are selected solely because they are held to contain some admissions which would be in favor of Gasquet's conclusions if entirely dissociated from other considerations. Not a hand-book of first-hand sources is mentioned and the list concludes with the pamphlet by the Bishop of Zanzibar written at the time of the Kikuyu Controversy, which must have come into the hands of Gasquet with the ink hardly dry, to be included in the list. Very likely this amazingly naive and transparently unhistorical set of lectures is circulated and recommended because the conclusions reached are the sole object. This is not constructive history. It is historical juggling. Yet how many readers, in selecting books on Church History, follow the habit so frequently ascribed to the feminine novel reader, of looking to see how the book ends up! A reasonable comment upon Gasquet's lectures and many another series from quite different sources would be: What a poor and slender case it must be which has to adopt such a childish method!

If the following suggestion comes under the eye of men thorough and eminent in their profession or branch of learning, it should appeal strongly to them. Give preference always to really *great* books of history. Condensations, primers, first-books and other elementary designations, may be useful for outlines if based upon true history and reliable authorities, but they can never make history live. *Great* books are not

necessarily *large* books nor many-volumed but works that have endured the tests and criticisms of readers and experts and are proved to have been weighty and permanent contributions to the literature of the subject. They cannot be ignored by the historical student, whether he accepts the conclusions reached or not. As a notable instance we may refer to Gibbon's "Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire." The writer was avowedly an antagonist of the claims of Christianity, but he is an historian of the highest rank and his admissions as to the widespread influence and wonderful growth of the Christian Church together with the straits to which he is put to explain the phenomena without conceding the divine origin of Christianity stand as unparalleled in significance as an apologetic for the Church.

In the class of historical writings entitled to be called great will be included among modern historians the works of William Bright, Bishop Creighton, Bishop Stubbs, Mr. Freeman, R. W. Dixon, James Gairdner, S. R. Gardiner, Hefelé, Doellinger, Duchesne, the Cambridge Histories and the *Histoire Generale* edited by Lavisse and Rambaud, all these being named as ordinarily accessible in first-class public and theological libraries. The constructive study of Church History cannot neglect them.

In the very brief space we may give to these suggestions we can do no more than emphasize a few points. First-class historical works should be read again and again, if not as a whole at least in certain sections. And while the temptation is continually to keep to the history proper, the value of reading with care all appendices and foot-notes is inestimably great. In certain cases the historical text is in the main a nucleus around which is gathered an immense amount of historical and illustrative material which is quite missed by the reader who ignores such running commentary.

Special subjects should be studied in the writings of specialists. That seems and is a truism, but one often ignored. Specialists have generally become such because of particular gifts and aptitudes in a certain subject. Lightfoot had peculiar

powers for historical criticism of documents. Not half a dozen scholars in several centuries have had anything like his ability as exhibited in the problem of the Epistles of Ignatius of Antioch. The late Mr. Denny specialized in certain aspects of the claims of the papacy, Bishop Creighton and Dr. Bright and Father Puller in other aspects. Dixon and Gairdner worked only on the Tudor period in English Church History. Their writings are not likely to be superseded. Of course the treatises of great historians and historical specialists are hard reading. All getting beneath the surface of subjects entails strenuous study, but there is no easy path to the solution of the problems of history.

Two methods of presenting history, from other than the method of scientifically constructed narrative, which throw strong sidelights on events and men are biography and the philosophy of history. The former makes the life of the Church unfold itself like a vivid drama with all the vigorous vitality and freshness that we associate with the dramatic art where personality counts for so much. The latter shows how the underlying principles of the kingdom of Christ on earth have been worked out and illustrated and combined with other factors so as to produce certain results. Here we discover the truth of Tennyson's observation, that

"Through the ages one eternal purpose runs
And the thoughts of men are widened with the process of the suns."

If you want to get a very full insight into the Oxford Movement hardly anything will be better than Liddon's four-volume Life of Dr. Pusey. There are many such biographical works which are indispensable in the constructive study of the history of the Church. For the philosophy of Church History, Creighton's Historical Essays and other occasional writings, Mozley's Essays Historical and Theological, Waterman's "God's Balance of Faith and Freedom," Hobhouse's Bampton Lectures, "The Church and the World," are examples.

There must be many who from time to time formulate aloud

or in their own thoughts the question, Are there any principles or historical conclusions which may be treated as established? The immense mass of controversial theology, ancient and modern, would seem to give some color to the cavil that nothing is positively settled. The constructive study of ecclesiastical history is mainly concerned with the effort to secure the recognition of some historical truths as practically closed questions. The evidence may be repeatedly examined and freshly stated, but without any alteration of the result. People are sometimes frankly puzzled by the refusal of the Church to allow such fresh arrangement and statement of the grounds on which truths rest. A knowledge of the various phases of such re-examinations would show them that the case in each instance almost invariably gains in solidity and strength by the process rather than the contrary.

We shall conclude this phase of our subject by noting:

II. *Some Historical Points which may be considered permanently established.*

We shall state the several points with conservatism, in such wise that few if any will be bold enough to challenge them in the light of the evidence.

(1) The Continuity of the Christian Church of the present day unbroken from the Day of Pentecost.

There has been no break. Even with a considerable latitude of definition as to what is meant by the Christian Church continuity is exhibited. Whether we take the statement of the Thirty-Nine Articles,—"The visible Church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men, in which the pure Word of God is preached, and the Sacraments be duly administered according to Christ's ordinance," or the extreme in another direction, that "The Christian Church is an association of people for the maintenance of public worship for those who care for it," history shows continuity. There is no sufficient evidence to indicate that the original group ever died out, and another sprang up which revived certain opinions of its predecessor but differed radically, and that this process has been going on recurrently. This fact of continuity is an all-important

premise in a number of related syllogisms having to do with the Church today.

(2) From whatever point we approach the history of this continuous Christian body it cannot be denied that the religious world at the present period presents three subdivisions and no more. We find Christian bodies which officially denominate themselves as *catholic,* three especially — Eastern, Latin and Anglican; and another series consists of bodies calling themselves Christian, but repudiating the term — catholic. They are officially on their own representation *non-catholic.* If we compare the first group with the second, history will afford strong evidence for the contention that the members of the first group have underlying characteristics which all three consider essential and a few which all three do not consider essential. On the other hand the members of the second or non-catholic group hold, each of them, something to be essential which the others and the catholic group do not estimate in this way; deny each something which one or more consider vital; and all differ from the members of the catholic group on one or several points which the latter hold to be of the essential constitution of the Christian Church.

A third group constitutes a *non-Christian* series. The members of the group may be unitarian, theistic, or otherwise, but their negative and common characteristic, the denial that Jesus is God, even though they in some sense and in some degree find a place for Christ in their system, separates them effectively from both the other groups officially.

The full study of the three groups, the first critically, the second sympathetically, the third honestly, will emphasize the radical divergences between the groups and the history of them all will witness to the fact that the groups do not really shade off insensibly into one another but have between them gulfs that cannot be bridged over. To give an illustration which cannot be expanded here, the highest Unitarian is nowhere near the same as the lowest Trinitarian, and the Irvingite body which calls itself catholic is unable by any terms or language to secure what the most evangelical of Catholics has, whether

he appreciates it or not, the episcopate of historic and apostolic succession.

(3) However the historians of the three Catholic Communions may disagree on certain subjects in their mutual history all alike can show with little difficulty that they trace back to a time when intercommunion had not been interrupted and so back to the Apostolic Age and the Day of Pentecost, while certain positive features and fruits to be observed in their later history afford a presumption that the present suspension of official intercommunion is due not to loss of primitive and essential characteristics but to causes, not trivial nor unimportant, but yet not of such a nature as to destroy the identity of each member of the group with the Church which is neither Eastern nor Western, Latin or Anglican, but Catholic, One, Apostolic and Holy.

(4) In *some sense* the possession of the episcopate of apostolic succession is witnessed to as the safeguard of orthodoxy and vitality. This is a most fascinating subject for research and evidence. A part of the evidence lies where it is voluntary blindness not to see it. The Apostles' Creed, for instance, is officially set forth and required, unmutilated, undenied in every article, positively taught in formularies by the Christian bodies that have kept and claim to have kept the episcopate *and nowhere else.* Some apparent exceptions to this sweeping statement disappear on careful examination, we add for the sake of noting that the challenge of the assertion is not unanticipated. The same is true in regard to vitality, little as the different members of the catholic group have on which to congratulate themselves for their correspondence to all their opportunities. Phariseeism is an ugly thing and we could not defend such an assertion did not that very assertion stand as the direct outcome of the catholic doctrine that the Church is a divine organism and all that is vital and energizing comes directly from its Divine Founder and the Divine Spirit in-dwelling. Change, breaches with their own history, reorganization, denials are obvious in the history of non-episcopal bodies. Witness the lapse of Trinitarian Congregationalism into bald Sabellian Unitarianism.

(5) In *some sense* the Sacramental system produces results unobtainable otherwise. This is a delicate and holy subject. The witness of the past is overwhelming, but the appreciation of the issue is bound up with a score of related matters. What is Christian Character? A high achievement in the natural virtues, kindness, self-restraint, generosity, courage, prudence; or a development of the distinctively Christian virtues, Faith, Hope and Love, along with the interior virtues, humility, meekness, purity, self-sacrifice? Have these latter developed outside the Sacramental Grace which the Church dispenses? We must remember that the initial sacrament, Holy Baptism, may be administered validly although no further sacraments follow, and that the baptized receive real grace. Probably no one contention is likely to call forth such an outburst of indignant challenge as this, that the monopoly of the highest type of Christian sanctity belongs to the Christian body which posesses and dispenses *all* the treasures of sacramental grace which is the Divine Life. Yet the witness is written very clearly on the pages of eighteen centuries of the history of the sacramental Church.

(6) The phenomena of unrest and revolutionary movements when examined over a wide extent of time in the Church's life have an interpretation which does not lie on the surface. They indicate not that the Church is in the wrong or that she is lacking in the ability to supply what men need, but that the human element is at fault and paying the penalty of unadmitted and unrecognized limitations. Distortion of revealed truth, the loss of balance between related truths, the neglect of essentials are set side by side with efforts to restore, recover and readjust. There is a close analogy between the health of the spiritual body and of the physical body. Illness is not necessarily a sign that the body is diseased. It may be the beneficent sign that the limitations of the body have been ignored or the laws of health broken. The body that is vigorous and perfect throws off illness or even disease, and recovers. The Body of Christ, the Church, has been continually experiencing the consequences of the neglect in some quarter or another of the laws of spirit-

ual, corporate health. The testimony to the need and value of the repair of the Christian Body by the divine life within is the continual answer to the cavils of those who would discredit it and innovate or begin afresh. Very salutary is the study of heresy and schism.

There are other principles which are capable of being set forth as established and which are also to be included in the fundamental premises of constructive history. Each of those named and briefly commented upon here, along with others, will be found to afford the groundwork upon which the Church builds up spiritual lives. How different the study of the divine organism becomes when approached thus, as an edifice, a structure which does not collapse periodically like a house of cards! How different, on the other hand, from a series of houses built on quite different plans and models,— the ideal of the aristocratic building like the millionaire's palace meant for the rich only, or the colonial type which is satisfactory only in certain surroundings, or the bungalow type, suitable for times of emptiness and vacation, or the portable house type which can be easily taken down and re-erected in another place, or a row of cells where each individual dwells by himself to be protected and housed, regardless of other individuals? The mighty cathedral seems to approach most nearly to a type of the Church as constructive history shows its rearing. But alas! even the cathedral is the work of man and man may lay it in ruins. The true figure of the Catholic Church is the " house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens." This is what the true use of Church History patiently worked out shows the Catholic Church to be. *Arthur Whipple Jenks.*

Far and wide, tho' all unknowing,
Plants for Thee each human breast;
Human tears for Thee are flowing;
Human hearts in Thee would rest.

The Church and the People

From the Guardian.

The following is the full text of the sermon preached by Canon A. C. Deane, Vicar of All Saints', Ennismore-gardens, in Westminster Abbey.

"Jesus then lifted up His eyes, and saw a great company." — St John vi. 5.

THE words come from to-day's Gospel. You will remember their context. Our Lord stands in deep thought, with downcast eyes. Presently upon His meditation breaks a stir of feet, the murmur and movement of a crowd. "Jesus then lifted up His eyes, and saw a great company." At once the time for meditation is ended; this sight impels Him to act. The men and women before Him are hungry; it must be the task of Himself and His disciples to see that they are fed. Here is a simple picture of the situation confronting the Church to-day, and of the work which, because it exists to carry on Christ's mission, it is bound to undertake.

And the very first need is that it should lift up its eyes, that it should look beyond its own immediate affairs, beyond the little band of disciples gathered round it, in order to become conscious of the hungering multitudes. That Church can have no growth and no future which contentedly limits its ministration to those who are already its faithful adherents. It must follow its Master's example, it must life up its eyes, and see a great company of men and women who as yet are strangers to it, but have souls which hunger for the Bread of Life. For what — let us try to face the question quite honestly — what to-day, at this supreme crisis in our history, at the moment when the things of the soul have a deeper significance than ever before, what are the actual relations between organized Christianity, as represented by the Church, and the great mass of the English people? By "the mass" I do not mean the less privileged classes alone. We are compelled to answer, I think, that among people educated and uneducated, among rich and poor, among the fashionable world and among

artisans, among men and women of mature age and, even more markedly, among the young, the conviction grows that the Church, with the Christianity it represents, is not a necessary, or even for ordinary folk a desirable, factor in life. Those holding such a view are not necessarily hostile to the Church. No, they are quite content that it should minister to the minority — people of a special temperament, they think — who seem to derive help from its services. They even recognize the value of the pulpit when it can do something "really useful," such as gaining recruits for munition works or subscriptions for a War Loan. Yet they feel — and they are pleased to find the Church itself apparently countenancing the view — that services and Eucharists and common prayer and intercession are peace-time luxuries, the abrogation of which under present conditions cannot injure our national life.

Meanwhile how are we as a Church, as individual Churchmen and as members of Christ's Society, attempting to grasp the situation and to amend it? To ignore it entirely is so easy — particularly easy, perhaps, for us clergy! Take the instance of any Incumbent here in London. He contrives, we will suppose, to fill his own church. He gathers together an eclectic congregation drawn from many parts of the Metropolis, and amounting to a few hundreds in all. It is a real temptation to him not to look beyond them, not to lift up his eyes, not to think of the great company, even among his own parishioners, who view him, his church, and the whole system of devotional observances they stand for, with good-humoured indifference. He will even imagine at times that if only every parish church would adopt the particular ritual and modes of worship employed in his own our difficulties would be at an end. Yet the plain truth which we clergy — though not we alone — are bound to recognize is simply that we have reached a crisis. Either our Church must lift up its eyes and see the great company it has failed as yet to feed, either it must recognize its responsibilities towards them, and, relegating to their right place all lesser preoccupations, must set itself wholeheartedly to the task of becoming the Church of England in fact as well as in name —

or else it will continue to minister only to a dwindling band of devotees, it must become at last a mere esoteric cult, an impotent pietistic anachronism.

But here I may anticipate two criticisms. "You are labouring the obvious," it may be said. "The Church does clearly realize the gulf existing between itself and masses of our people, and is seeking means to bridge it. Think of the National Mission, undertaken for this very purpose. Or look at the Church newspapers, examine the reports of Diocesan Conferences. You will find in them full consideration of this subject; you will see how many expedients are being put forward with a view to making the English Church a more effective agency in our national life." The answer can be brief. We are encouraged to hope that the National Mission has accomplished as yet no more than its preliminary stage, and at any stage it would be wrong, obviously, to judge a movement of this nature solely by its visible results. That already the Mission has done good in individual parishes we may thankfully believe. But will any competent observer claim that, as yet, it has even begun to influence the religious life of our nation as a whole? Such a sequel, we pray, may come. Only its coming depends, under God, upon the very point we have been considering, upon the willingness of the Church really to think out big questions, to see things in their right proportion, to aim at something more than the edification of the faithful, to consult more than a narrow circle of clergy, to imagine less that lay opinion is adequately represented by a group of ecclesiastically-minded laymen. So far, it must be said frankly, the very character of the solutions propounded in Church newspapers and Conferences only proves how signally we have failed to grasp the nature of the real problem to be solved. No one who had gone beneath the surface of things, no one who had really thought out what the alienation of the people from the Church implies, or pondered the deep causes which have led to it, could dream of remedying it by such expedients as are warmly championed to-day. They range, you will find, from the adoption of a "full Catholic ceremonial"—a phrase meaning as a rule precisely those aids to devotion which happen

to suit the speaker — to Eucharists at one particular hour, or a modernized Prayer-book, or extempore prayer, or congregational singing, or the abolition of pew-rents, or the reduction of Episcopal incomes, or the establishment of Church Councils. Such matters, or some such, are doubtless important in their various degrees. But to account them primary, to imagine that you are really going to re-Christianize England by recourse to any or all of such devices, to encourage the belief — as we are doing just now, for instance, by the controversy about Reservation — that the main interest of the Church in these tremendous days is absorbed by ecclesiastical details and disputes — this is surely to hinder rather than to help that task of feeding the multitudes. It hinders because it strengthens the idea that the Church and all it can supply — its idiom, its methods, its interests — have no sort of relationship with the real needs of the average man.

But, again, it may be said —" The parallel you attempt to draw between to-day's situation and the Gospel scene is unfair. The great company which Christ saw was at least conscious of its hunger and ready to welcome the ministrations of those who came to feed it. To-day the Church's chief difficulty is the people's lack of a sense of need. They are indifferent; they do not want to be fed; they show no spiritual hunger." Well, any such statement can only be met, I think, with a flat denial of its truth. I am convinced, on the contrary, that, taking our people as a whole, their spiritual appetite, the craving of the soul for food, was never stronger than now. The war has made them face the ultimate problems of human existence. They long quite passionately for faith and comfort. Even the ordinary talk you may hear in the drawing-room, the Club, the mess, gives some evidence of that. If people do not turn to the Church, the fact does not mean that they feel no hunger, but simply that they doubt the Church's ability to satisfy it. The Church, they think, is too engrossed over the distribution of loaves and fishes among its own disciples to care for the great company beyond. So they look elsewhere. They will listen to any new creed which promises to give them what they seek; they will turn to spiritualism,

for example. Again, the apparent indifference of the great industrial movement to Christianity really means this — that the movement itself is used to provide a substitute for religion. In it the corporate spirit and the sense of brotherhood find a satisfaction which, through our own fault, they have failed to find in the Church.

What, then, must we do? When we have achieved the first stage, when we have discerned the great company and their claims upon us, how are we to feed them? First and beyond all else, we have to set Christ Himself before the English people — not as a mere Figure of history, but as a living Presence, as an imperishable Power. We want to bring the anxious, wistful men and women of to-day — for anxious and wistful they are — into His Presence, and to leave them face to face with Him. And as we see the transcendent need of this and the relative unimportance of all else, as we gain a cleared sense of proportion, a new Broad Church movement may begin — by which I do not mean the creation of a new "party," or a development of the views commonly associated with the term "Broad Church" to-day, but a movement in which people of every diverse ecclesiastical views may unite. There will still be many opinions on subsidiary points from which we shall love to differ; there will be none from which we shall not differ in love. We shall look forward to a time in this life when every one will come round to our way of thinking; we shall not even desire such a day. For we shall know that the whole truth must always transcend the particular aspect of it which alone is visible to any one person or party. We shall admit the relativity of knowledge. We shall own that doctrinal differences will endure to the end of time. To the end of time, also, there will be, we shall admit frankly, no one "correct," or even best, kind of service or ritual. They are quite ancillary; their value is simply to aid our communion with God, and, while human temperaments differ, the type of ceremonial and devotional observances that help the spiritual life of one man will not be those that prove most helpful to another. All such things we shall relegate to their rightful secondary place. The power and love of our living Saviour

— ah! it is these that matter, it is these that must overcome the world.

So we shall face the great company. And, gigantic as our task appears, there are certain avenues of approach which seem to be specially open to us just now. Here I must be content merely to indicate them. First, this war has quickened the keen desire for faith in the persistence of life through death, a desire which the Gospel of the Risen Lord can satisfy as nothing else can. Secondly, there is a strong sense of duty, which will find its best fulfillment in Christian discipleship, if we emphasize not merely man's need of God, but God's need of man. Finally, we shall utilize that corporate spirit, the growth of which is so characteristic of our age. We shall show how the Church and its Sacramental system appeal to that spirit; we shall admit our past mistakes in this respect, we shall confess that a merely individualistic religion is not the religion of Christ. And, by every practical means, we shall try to make actual the concept of the Church as Christ's Society, as a brotherhood both human and Divine, as the means through which the corporate spirit will find its inspiration, its sanction, and its crown. Shunning the folly of figuring as a partisan in industrial disputes, the Church will create the atmosphere in which such disputes have their best chance of adjustment. It will preach fearlessly to rich and poor alike. But, following its Master's example, it will encourage often and rebuke seldom. It will show how essential to the enrichment of life religion is, how without it human nature remains stunted and incomplete. The *ecclesia* will grow when mere ecclesiasticism dies an unlamented death. And, while providing for the individual needs of each soul, it will unite men in the brotherhood of Jesus Christ our Lord. It will see things in their true perspective. It will concern itself far less than hitherto with Committees, and far more with character; its aim will be to make not machinery, but men. And so may this great Church of ours become again the Church of the English people.

Does all this seem but a far-off vision? Let us set ourselves, my friends — for both clergy and laity must take their parts —

let us set ourselves, in God's Name, to turn the vision into reality. The need is urgent. The crisis is real. The great company is before our eyes. And we will not hesitate, you and I, because our personal equipment for our little share in the task, our few loaves and fishes — our influence and opportunities — seem so small. Rather, relying on our Master's power, we will strive with a single purpose to fulfil His command, and, blessed by Him, we shall not strive in vain.

The Sabbath for Man

From The London Times

THE letters on Sunday observance which have appeared lately in *The Times* manifest a real cleavage of opinion on the nature of the claim that day has on Christians. All are agreed that Sunday is to be observed as a day of rest and worship, but it is obvious that men derive their sanction for this belief from different sources. With regard to the Fourth Commandant some urge that while Christians are justified in observing the first day of the week instead of the seventh, the law of the Sabbath rest is still valid for the Christian Sunday.

On the other hand, there are many who, while acknowledging that the Sabbath was divinely ordained for the Jews, claim that its purpose cannot be identified with the object for which Sunday observance was instituted, and that therefore the modes of observing the two days must be different. The Christian Sunday is a weekly commemoration of the Ressurrection. The Lord rose from the dead on the first day of the week, and from the beginning the disciples gathered together on that day to worship Him. Jewish Christians continued to keep the Sabbath as the weekly day of rest, while they observed Sunday by a special act of united worship with fellow-disciples of the Risen Christ. The Sabbath was never recognized by Gentile Christians. Cessation from work on that day was not required from Christians, nor was it possible for most of them. It was not a

public holiday, and Christians had to be content to meet together in the early morning for the Eucharist before going to their accustomed labors. Gradually, with the growing influence of Christianity, the Lord's Day became more and more a rest day, but it was not until Constantine ordered abstention from all work on Sunday, except in agriculture, that this became the law of the Church.

In pre-Reformation times in this country Sunday was observed with considerable strictness so far as trade and labour were concerned, but national games and sports, such as archery, were not only allowed, but encouraged by the authorities in Church and State. When the Puritans gained supremacy they did everything possible to make the English Sunday approximate to the Jewish Sabbath. They not only found in the Fourth Commandment the law of abstention from work on Sunday, but the method of Sabbatizing the Sunday was peculiar to this country, and was quite unknown among the Churches of the Reformation on the Continent.

No doubt the recitation of the Ten Commandments introduced into the Communion Service in 1552 did much to maintain the Puritanical Sunday, and it is worth noticing that those who deprecate the Archbishop of Canterbury's sanction of Sunday labour in the present distress point out the inconsistency of reciting the Fourth Commandment at the Sacrament, when it is understood that the worshippers an hour or two later may be working in the fields, with the approval of their spiritual guides, in plain contradiction of the literal statement of the Sabbath law. This may suggest the inexpediency of reciting the Commandments in the Communion Office, but it cannot determine the law of Sunday observance.

Even if the Christian Sunday and the Jewish Sabbath were identical, or more closely associated than they are, it would appear that labour on that day to secure an adequate supply of food in times of urgent need is more than justified. "The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath." It is worth recalling the fact that this declaration was made when the disciples were going through the cornfields on the Sabbath

day, and the Pharisees protested because they plucked the ears of corn. On other occasions the Master vindicated the duty of saving life, even though it meant laborious work on the Sabbath. This is the justification of the Archbishop's sanction to workers in the fields at the present time. No one condemns our sailors and soldiers for defending themselves against the enemy on Sunday, nor do we blame the minesweepers who clear the seas on that day. Thus they save life. It is possible that the war may be decided by our ability to maintain the food supply of this country. In these circumstances those who engage at every opportunity in work which adds to this supply are saving life, and this surely is a work of charity which is to be encouraged on Sundays as on other days.

We should not minimize the importance of the devout observance of the Lord's Day. We need not be too free in our criticism of the Puritanical Sunday. It has done much for this country, and we owe to its discipline and devotion more than we are sometimes disposed to own.

The Creed and the Imagination

From The London Times.

TO-MORROW the ancient words in which the Church in its Eucharist, confesses and adores the Holy Trinity will be repeated. Some worshippers will be content to say the words without inquiring too closely into origins. Others will resent what they consider an attempt to define the indefinable in terms of ancient thought. "His name will flee, the while Thou mouldest Thy lips for speech." There are others, again, for whom the Creed releases the mind to travel back in sympathy and wonder over the highway of man's spiritual thought. They will travel far and pass by many battlefields of the spirit, and study the inscriptions on many pillars, where are told the narrow escapes of the Church in its stormy history. To them the doctrine of the Trinity is no dry and guarded formula,

imparted in some moment of time to a listening ear. No human name can be attached to the doctrine, not even that of Athanasius. It gathers into itself, as in a cold summary, the thoughts and intellectual visions and spiritual insight of many seers. It is the epitome of much thinking upon the problem of the Divine Nature, and the experience of the Divine Redemption.

In the doctrine of the Trinity, Greek thought has given its polished weapons to the Church; Plato and his heirs have brought the glory of their spiritual pilgrimages into the City of God. The Church, with its own amazing experiences, found the language in which to express and to safeguard them already waiting. On Trinity Sunday the imagination goes back to a place where the waters met — where the Church, with its knowledge of the Redeemer and its unexpressed mysteries, found forms ready moulded and reserved. At the very words of the Creed the mind presses back to Augustine and Athanasius, to Philo and Plato, with many others on the way — back to the noisy markets and schools of Byzantium and Alexandria; at the parting of the ways on the one stream back to Greece, on the other to Canaan. And always there are sub-tones to the music; hints of the mystery are heard from Egypt and India; it is a relief and not a bewilderment to Faith that so many adumbrations of the Christian doctrine should have been discovered. The harmony of the Creed is all the richer for these undertones.

The words may be said coldly now, but once they were like molten lava. They were cries which the little flock shouted in the hour of martyrdom; they were the words of victory when danger was over. They have their glorious past; no less have they shameful memories. The profession of the Creed has often been a passport to the backstairs of palaces, and often the occasion for persecution. The story of the Councils of the Church confirms the faith of the Church in its Divine Inspirer; only He could have saved the Church in such an atmosphere and with such advocates from certain destruction. Yet in each hour of decision, as though guided by an overruling Spirit, the Church chose the one way of intellectual salvation. The records come

back as though they told of a long confus'd battle, in which few knew all that was involved, and men often defended the Truth with unclean weapons and yet the Spirit of Truth never left the scene.

The note of adoration will be found only if the worshippers can penetrate through the form to the content, and discover that the words enshrine the story of an Eternal Purpose wrought out in the Cross upon the fields of time, and forever made operative in human wills through the Holy Spirit. The saints who contended for the intellectual setting of the truth were safeguarding the reality of that Experience and Hope by which they lived. Inevitably and slowly they were driven to the doctrine of the Holy Trinity.

These thinkers, whose quick intellects no one with any insight can despise, were concerned for the honour of the Eternal God. How could He be out of the great things which were happening in this human life? He must be in it; any other God would be impossible. It would be a poor compensation to leave Him the ordering of the stars if from Him were taken His part in the incomparably more wonderful task of redeeming humanity. They who adored the Eternal Lord under the name of the Holy, Blessed, and Glorious Trinity were jealous for the honour of God. Through the words, which have become cold to us, there throbs the mightiest of all spiritual passions, the jealousy for God. Men were led to this apparently intellectual statement of their belief not because they cared to set and to answer metaphysical puzzles, but because they wished to ensure for their redemption an eternal reality. They longed, moreover, to guard their Eternal Creator from the slur that in a world like this, with such a redeeming love of action, He should be above the scene, and not sharing in its pain and glory.

The words at best set forth the mystery, which men can only know in part; but they may be repeated still with something of the former passion and adoration if through the things said by the saints the worshippers may penetrate to the things they never said, because such things can never be spoken.

THE CHURCH AT WORK

The Church Periodical Club

WHAT is this church Periodical Club," asked the rector of an eastern parish, " that men like Bishop Biller, Bishop Tucker, and Archdeacon Stuck are willing to speak at its meetings? " Somewhere in North Carolina the people told a visiting missionary, " We don't know much about the Church, but we know all about the Church Periodical Club." In these two sentences we have the viewpoint of those to whom food for the mind is as much a matter of course as food for the body, and of those others (so many of them!) who look to the C. P. C. for the satisfaction, wholly or in part, of their intellectual and, maybe, spiritual needs.

The aims of the C. P. C. are to make the helpful printed page of use to someone until it is worn out, to share with others what has brought pleasure or satisfaction to ourselves, to give concrete expression to the " love of the brethren " that we profess as members of Christ. The method is simple, branches of the Club are organized along parish and diocesan lines, members are asked to forward to designated addresses the magazines and books they have read, the games they no longer play, the records of which they are tired, the pictures at which they never look. Such utilization of used material was the original plan of the Club, and constitutes still its principal effort, making it possible for almost anyone to qualify for membership. From those who are able to give new material further help is asked. As the workers in the mission field, in the small parish, and the crowded institution come to appreciate the C. P. C. better, they naturally make known the larger needs of their work, technical books, reference books for libraries and schools, recent theology for the clergy, books for men preparing for Holy Orders, and last, but not least, tracts and books for the missionaries to use among the scattered people to whom they can give but little personal instruction. It is with some hesitancy that this last item is mentioned, as it has been the sad experience of the

writer that, while there is enthusiastic response to the story of the rancher so lost in his first good magazine that nothing but a beating at the hands of his wife could recall him to a sense of milking time, a pall of coldness and indifference settles over an audience at the first suggestion of the need of Church literature for propaganda. And Christian Science continues to gather in the converts.

Whatever the thing sent, the sender is asked to get in touch by correspondence, whenever possible, with the recipient. Since the early days of the Club the establishment of a friendly relation has been the basis of its work. The material given is useful, but that material plus personality is a gift whose value is beyond computing, lifted entirely out of the class of miscalled charity. A priest whose failing health of mind prevented any practical use of his magazines would hold them tenderly in his arms when they came, conscious still of the thought and love they represented. "Chaplain," said a man in prison, "I know what Heaven and hell are. It's hell to be forgotten, it's Heaven to be just remembered."

Directly or indirectly the C. P. C. quite literally renders service to all sorts and conditions of men, bishops, clergy, lay workers, teachers, and students, men in the Army and Navy, inmates of hospitals and prisons, and perhaps more than all "just people," like ourselves in all save fulness of opportunity. To share this fulness and thus to be a good member of the C. P. C. calls for a little time, a little thought, a little perseverance, for a willingness to make at times a venture of faith and send without expectation of response or gratitude, and for the expenditure of such money as is possible. Special effort is being made to enlarge the membership among those who know and care for the best in literature and life. There is still a lurking belief in the minds of many that any missionary in an isolated station will greet with joy an out-of-date commentary or the ponderous sermons of our forefathers. It is difficult to eliminate the tendency to think of Alaska in terms of the *Saturday Evening Post* and the detective tale and to convince our contributors that there, as in all pioneer countries, men are

demanding real food for thought. There must be Churchmen who read such journals as *North American Review, Scientific American,* and *Nineteenth Century,* but they do not often come in the way of the C. P. C. A recent visitor to some of our Southern missions reported the great value of C. P. C. gifts with the added comment, "The best is none too good for the work that is being done and the workers."

"What do *you* know about B.?" asked a Bishop in response to an inquiry concerning mission work recently begun in his diocese. "More than anyone else," was the prompt reply, "the C. P. C. opened the way." And indeed in many directions the C. P. C. does just this, opens the way, for the girl to go through High School and for candidates working in the field to prepare for Holy Orders, for whole communities to rise from degradation to decency and for isolated missions to grasp the reality of the Catholic Church. A picture postcard with the blessing of God may turn a mountain boy into an honored member of one of the learned professions or may break down the barrier between a dying man and the hospital chaplain. A Church paper may be the instrument to bring a man to Confirmation or to establish a new mission of the Church. When even the war pictures in our Sunday papers become the determining factor in bringing a Japanese school boy to Christianty, we must stand in awe before the power of the printed page and our responsibility for its use.

Mary E. Thomas,
Executive Secretary.

A Day's Work at the Church Missions House

ALL baptized members of our Church have a proprietary interest in The Church Missions House. Although built with money given by private individuals, it was erected for a special purpose, in order that the Church at large might be able in an efficient way to obey her Lord's command to

carry His Message to all His creatures. It is the headquarters from which the Church's representatives go out to every part of the world, and into which flow, from all parts of the country, the means which enable them to go. Some little account of its activities may be of interest to those to whom the words "Church Missions House" mean nothing more than the address to which their payments on the apportionment must be directed.

From the two rooms in the old Bible House of thirty-five years ago the work of The Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society (its cumbersome but legal title) has grown to such dimensions that it now occupies the greater part of a large building at the corner of Fourth Avenue and Twenty-second Street, New York. Under the same roof are housed the offices of the Secretaries of the House of Bishops and the House of Deputies, the Church Building Fund Commission, the Social Service Commission, the Church Periodical Club, the Girls' Friendly Society and the Daughters of the King. The work of the missionary society is carried on in many departments, foreign, domestic, Latin-America, forward movement, educational, the treasury, the Women's Auxuliary and editorial, the latter including the publication of The Spirit of Missions and the numerous other publications of the Board. Each department is in charge of a secretary, while the president, Bishop Lloyd, has general oversight over all.

Perhaps no better idea of the scope and diversity of the work can be had than by a glance at the mail, with the opening of which each day's work begins. The letters come pouring in, early in the morning and all day, from all quarters of the globe and from all sorts and conditions of men — and women! In the president's office missives from the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Presiding Bishop on grave matters of state may be opened side by side with the pitiful story of a struggling little mission in the mountains; one letter contains a check for a thousand dollars for the One Day's Income plan, the next literally the widow's mite; a western missionary bishop writes for counsel, an industrial school among the negroes in the South

for help; the head of a hospital in the Orient tells of the need for nurses, a woman writes making the offer of her life for the Church's need. The letters of the foreign secretary and the secretary for Latin-America bring news of progress in churches, schools and hospitals abroad, and too often tell of opportunities that cannot be grasped for lack of funds. The treasurer's mail is more prosaic but it makes possible the romance of missions; through it the "apportionment" is made a thing of life, the means of carrying light to "them that sit in darkness and the shadow of death." With the educational and forward movement secretaries we are in touch with the leaders of mission study classes and "every member" campaigns; there are requests for duplex envelopes and lantern lectures; books are wanted from the lending library and information about summer conferences is in demand. Reports from the Pilgrimage of Prayer as it sweeps across the country come to the Woman's Auxiliary, and the hard-pressed wife of a western missionary writes of her relief at the prospect of a "box." The mail of The Spirit of Missions is diversified: requests for renewal, articles, photographs, "letters to the editor," words of appreciation or criticism, appeals for information — the thousand and one things that come to a man who edits a magazine.

The mail has been opened in less time than it takes to tell about it and the business of the day begins. In a dozen offices letters are being dictated to stenographers; typewriters are clicking as the orders for leaflets are being made ready for the shipping department, which is busy making up packages of literature. Lantern lectures are being overhauled and sent away. In the editorial office *The Spirit of Missions* is going to press; the editor and his assistants are making up dummies and reading proof; printer's and lithographer's boys are rushing in and out with copy and cuts. Just as the magazine is ready for the press a telegram comes in telling that one of our veterans at the front has dropped on the field of battle; the forms must be held, an editorial written and fitting tribute paid. And so it goes, on each and all of the five floors is heard the hum of business.

At noon the bell rings, business is suspended and the staff gathers in the chapel for noonday prayer for missions. Often missionaries returning from or going to the field are present. A hymn is sung, a psalm and a few prayers are said, and then the routine of the day is resumed.

Once a week the president and his staff of secretaries meet as a Council of Advice. They have before them all matters requiring adjustment which have come up during the week. If of minor importance they are settled in the Council, but the majority of affairs are passed on to the Executive Committee of the Board, representing all parts of the country, which meets once a month. Questions of policy and the larger matters of state are referred to the Board which meets in February, May, October and December.

Often there are visitors and they are always welcome. It is the desire of the officers that Church people generally should feel when they come to the Missions House that they are not visiting but coming home. It is the Church's house, built for the dispatch of the Church's business, and all who labor in it are the servants of the Church at large. It would be gratifying to those to whom the Board of Missions has entrusted the details of its business if our Church people would more geneally realize this and familiarize themselves with the life at the Church Missions House. *Kathleen Hore.*

Christianity is no appeal to selfishness, but a call to self-surrender and self-dedication. It appeals to men only in so far as they "lose" themselves and lay aside all self-seeking. Nor is it, as some have contended, merely an individualistic religion, as if its mission were exhausted in the "saving" of individual souls. Its message is essentially social, and concerns the present order and present needs of the world. The salvation of a soul means something nobler and wider than mere deliverance from personal consequences of sin in a future state.— *R. L. Ottley, D. D.*

The American Church Monthly

PUBLISHED MONTHLY BY

TEMPLE PUBLISHING CORPORATION

93 NASSAU STREET, NEW YORK, N. Y.

President: GEORGE A. ARMOUR, Princeton, N. J.
Vice President: GUY VAN AMRINGE, 31 Nassau Street, New York
Secretary: THE REV. CHARLES C. EDMUNDS, D.D., 4 Chelsea Square, New York
Treasurer: HALEY FISKE, 1 Madison Avenue, New York
Business Manager: The Rev. WILLIAM H. A. HALL, 93 Nassau Street, New York

EDITORIAL COUNCIL: Charles S. Baldwin, Ph.D., *Professor of Rhetoric, Columbia University;* the Rev. J. G. H. Barry, D.D., *Rector of the Church of St. Mary the Virgin, New York;* the Rev. Charles C. Edmunds, D.D., *Professor of New Testament Literature, General Theological Seminary;* the Rev. Hughell E. W. Fosbroke, D.D., *Dean of the General Theological Seminary;* the Rev. Francis J. Hall, D.D., *Professor of Dogmatic Theology, General Theological Seminary;* the Rev. Arthur W. Jenks, D.D., *Professor of Ecclesiastical History, General Theological Seminary;* the Rev. William T. Manning, D.D., *Rector of Trinity Church, New York;* the Rev. John Mockridge, D.D., *Rector of St. James Church, Philadelphia;* the Rev. Ralph B. Pomeroy, B.D., *Rector of Trinity Church, Princeton, N. J.;* Chandler R. Post, Ph.D., *Assistant Professor of Greek and of Fine Arts, Harvard University;* Robert K. Root, Ph.D., *Professor of English, Princeton University;* the Rev. Hamilton Schuyler, *Rector Trinity Church, Trenton, N. J.;* Chauncey B. Tinker, Ph.D., *Professor of English Literature, Yale University;* the Rev. Lucius Waterman, D.D., *Rector of St. Thomas Church, Hanover, N. H.*

Two Dollars a Year — Twenty cents a Copy

Canadian subscription, $2.25 a Year — Foreign subscription, $2.50 a Year

Volume II — SEPTEMBER, 1917 — Number 1

EDITORIAL COMMENT

AN authentic incident of recent occurrence suggests itself as apropos of the spiritual crisis of the moment. A Church lad, well brought up in the Faith, while away from his parents was under necessity of an immediate and critical operation. No time could be allowed for friends or relatives to come and the surgeons proceeded with their preparations for operating. The anaesthetic was about to be administered and the doctors directed according to their habit that the boy should count as he inhaled the ether. But the boy, clearly understanding the seriousness of the situation and that he might never recover consciousness in this world, replied to the doctor, "This is no time for counting. I believe in God the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth," and so on with the Apostles' Creed, until the anaesthetic took effect. What

mattered to him was that whether he lived or died, he should live or die in the Faith of Christ, as authoritatively declared by the Catholic Church.

THE present is no time for counting, for marking time, for waiting to see how things are going to turn out in the world. The duty of the Church is to stand clearly and definitely for the Faith whole and unimpaired as summed up in the Creeds. Spiritual Preparedness is vitally important. Back of all the war of nations lies a greater, more protracted and deadlier war, the conflict between God and Satan. The cunning, the determination, the greed for power, the unscrupulousness as to methods, the cruelty, the lying, the treachery and the deceit, the loss of high sense of honor,— all these are characteristics of Satan's warfare against the Almighty, as we have the history of the fallen archangel set forth in Holy Scripture. The ideals for which Christian nations are contending are the ideals and facts of truth as revealed in and by Jesus Christ and taught throughout the Christian centuries by the Holy Ghost in the Catholic Church, of mercy and pity and justice as essentials in the Being and Nature of God and exhibited in His providential dealings with mankind; the brotherhood of man, not primarily due to common membership in the human race, but because of the essential change introduced in that race when God took flesh of Mary Ever-Virgin, and raised that Flesh to the state of freedom from the domination of sin and death in the Resurrection, and in that Flesh ascended to the state of glorious reigning in heaven, while not leaving His Body the Church but continuing to abide in that Church.

EVERY article of the Catholic Creeds has been set at naught in modern times in a thousand different ways. This has been done by kingdoms and individuals, by classes and groups in society, by the scholar in the pride of his learning apart from the source of true knowledge, by the Bishop in his condoning of false, heretical, destructive teaching, by the Priest who disre-

gards his ordination vows, by the baptized and confirmed who refuse the authority of the Church and do what each one in his own eyes considers to be right. And now the crisis which is in a considerable measure the outcome of spiritual deadness before the war is upon us in the war and will come with an increase of danger with the after-the-war situation. Metaphorically, surgeons, political, social, legislative, ethical, are leaning over the Church to dissect and probe and cut in an endeavor apparently inevitable to remedy the disease which they have been diagnosing. They would like to soothe the Church into a slumber while they work. They bid it count — numbers, wealth, respectability, popularity, outward signs of visible success — and so sink into a lethargy from which it may never, they think, awaken, or only to find the operation over and something lost from its essential constitution. The analogy fails, but the lesson can be read. The Church must not count but reiterate with strong, clear utterance the Faith once for all delivered to the Saints. For all practical purposes the Church lives only if it lives in that Faith, and works in its application to the minutest as well as the greatest affairs of life here and life hereafter.

IS the Church alive to the demand for spiritual preparedness? When we say "the Church" we mean the Church of the Catholic Creeds, not any one-sided presentation of that Church. We do not mean protestantism. If ever the latter stood convicted of failure in vital Christianity it is at the present moment. Where protestantism is popular it is because it administers opiates and bids men count — that is, to do irrelevant, colorless things. Where protestantism is discredited the explanation is that when men and nations in deadly peril asked for real positive gifts, absolution, sacramental grace, truths to live and to die by, it had nothing to give. And exactly as the Catholic Church, any or every section, Eastern or Western, Latin or Anglo-Saxon, has allowed the intrusion of any species of protestantism (and none are quite free), the popularity or the impotence is exposed and the essential, inherent strength is

hidden from the sight of those who are looking not for anodynes to lull into immediate though temporary relief, but the "saving health among all nations."

WE are trying to lead up to a point. The world of nations is soon (please God) to be engaged in endeavors to safeguard itself against tricks of diplomacy, words that can be played with fast and loose, treaties that are only subterfuges, half-truths (the devil's most subtle weapon). Armies that have been under iron discipline, men who have endured continuous and terrible privations, officers who have been under authority, all will sooner or later return to life at home. They will have learned to appreciate — many of them — discipline, authority, self-control and abstemiousness. If they find a Church that corresponds in these particulars they will recognize it as a power, a safe-guard, a strong tower of help.

What if they find the Church otherwise? What respect will they have for a Church where an officer high in prominence declares he does not believe Jesus to be God, and another in his discharge of the responsible teaching office as a Priest, quibbling with the technical terms of religion, asserts that while he believes the Virgin Birth and the Resurrection himself, he does not think it necessary for others so to believe? To believe is not the synonym for opinion.

The great prayer for the Church in the Eucharist emphasizes the duty of Bishops and other Ministers "that they may both by their life and doctrine set forth thy true and lively Word and rightly and duly administer thy holy Sacraments." The inferences are clear. The Church is a teaching Church. How many know and can state clearly to others why they are Churchmen and not Baptists or Methodists, or Jews or Unitarians? The Church is a Sacramental Church. That means a great deal more than a haphazard, once-a-month-if-you-feel-like-it, or Easter-and no-other-time-of-the-year practice of communions, or even the rare and, outside of large cities, almost unknown daily Eucharist. The Sacraments in the Church's life are meant to stand out in as marked a way for everyone as the soldier's roll-call and drills.

The Church is a democratic body. There are no class distinctions. Rented pews and parish Churches on swell avenues with "chapels" a block or two away for the non-aristocratic element are neither Christian nor Catholic.

The Church is a refuge and hospital for sinners. Protection and medicines are afforded to supply the strength needed by the "weakness of our mortal nature" and for the healing of the diseases of the soul. That function of the Church must not be denied nor concealed. There must be distinctly set forth the Gospel truth that sin is wide-spread in society and is the disease that is dragging down the world. The duty of the clergy requires them to act as physicians of souls, though they are not by virtue of their ordination good money-raisers, skillful organizers and great and original, with the strong possibility of being heretical thinkers.

The time is at hand for spiritual preparedness and for us to be true to the Church of our allegiance, not to an adaptation or a travesty thereof. Are we to continue to allow our opportunity to be lost through our parochialism, enslavement to popular opinion, adulation of successful business methods, fear of man so that we dare not speak out and say that pride and ambition and extravagant living and doubtfully honest business methods as well as condoned financial maxims and practices are evil? No, we are learning our lesson. German protestantism has worked out before our eyes some of its responsibility for the present war. Protestantized Germanism — a militarism whereby the world seeks to conquer and enslave the Church — is the correlative aim of a powerful few today who "profess and call themselves Christian." It must not be attained.

Holy intention is to the actions of a man that which the soul is to the body, or form to its matter, or the root to the tree, or the sun to the world, or the fountain to a river, or the base to the pillar: for without these the body is a dead trunk, the matter is sluggish, the tree is a block, the world is darkness, the river is quickly dry, the pillar rushes into flatness and ruin; and the action is sinful, or unprofitable, or vain.

— *Jeremy Taylor.*

BOOK REVIEWS

Basic Ideas in Religion, or Apologetic Theism. By Richard W. Micou, D.D. late Professor of Theology and Apologetics at the Theological Seminary in Virginia. Edited by Paul Micou, M.A. B. D. 473 pp. with Notes and Appendices. New York City: The Association Press, 1916.

The 470 odd pages of this book contain the substance of the courses on a most important department of theology given by a gifted teacher, the late Dr. Micou, whose untimely death in 1912 caused widespread sorrow. A succession of students, who had profited by his instruction, will welcome this memorial of their former Master who, from its pages, though "dead yet speaketh." But the book should make more than this personal appeal. Every clergyman would find the study of it most helpful to him in the task which is his as "set for the defense of the Gospel." If the average clergyman of our Church was well grounded in the subjects so ably handled by Dr. Micou, and more particularly filled with the spirit which breathes from his every page, it would do much to abate the not infrequent criticism of much of the preaching in our Churches; there certainly would be fewer "sermonettes by preacherettes."

Apologetics is, of course, no new thing. It is as old as the Gospel. The aggressive nature of Christianity has always laid it open to attack. The Christian preacher is obliged constantly to defend it against misrepresentation and denial. But each age has its own apologetic. It is the duty of the preacher of to-day to be familiar with that which belongs to his day. An apologia which once was valuable may (as so many have) become antiquated and useless. To be effective, the Christian Apologist must combine with his sure grasp upon his own position an equally definite and sympathetic knowledge of that of his opponent. He must be in accord with the "ruling ideas of his age," he must employ the methods, follow the spirit and *speak the language* of his day. Nowhere is "zeal without knowledge" more fatal than here. The demand to-day is for "a reasoning together" rather than a bald appeal to authority — be it Church or Bible. Any other sort may style itself an apologia, but it will be taken for what it really is, *"an apology," vox praeterea nil.*

Basic Ideas in Religion may be said to measure fairly up to the standard of what such a book should be. In it we have the matured thought of a genuine apologist. Dr. Micou was a scholar. He had early gained distinction in the Classics and Philosophy. He was very widely

read. But he was no "cloistered scholar." His learning had been severely tested. For a dozen or more years he was the rector of a very large parish in a busy manufacturing city of New England where he gained a deserved reputation as preacher and citizen. This contact with many minds served him well in later years. His knowledge was tried out; how thoroughly, the pages of this volume abundantly testify. For twenty years he ably filled the Chair of Apologetics, first at Philadelphia and later at Alexandria. The experience of the class room still further tested his knowledge. It is out of the ripened experience of a well-filled mind that this book on apologetic theism comes. It may lack the profundity of Flint and the philosophic breadth of Royce, but Dr. Micou's treatment of his chosen theme has distinct value and deserves, as it certainly will receive, a careful reading.

In the brief limits of a review an exhaustive examination of its contents is out of the question, though the temptation is strong to take up one and another of its chapters and deal with it in extenso. We must be content with the bare intimation of its general subject compressed in a sentence or two.

This volume was designed to be the Introduction to a series of Studies which should embody the matured thought in one and another of the departments of Theology he had made peculiarly his own. This book has a pathetic interest as but "the beginning of an unfinished task," whose excellence increases our sorrow at his untimely death. For what he had in mind, Dr. Micou has laid deep and strong foundations. Mr. Balfour, in his Foundations of Belief, declares "The decisive battles of theology are fought beyond the frontiers." On this principle Dr. Micou properly begins with the two essentials for any abiding faith, the personality of God and the personality of man. These he rightly asserts are the primary postulates of theology, intuitions, "without which there can be no religion." The reading of the book, to be intelligent, may well begin with the study of the Note A of the Appendix, a wonderfully lucid treatment of Postulates and Intuitions. From this premise he proceeds to a thorough and systematic treatment, first of the Idea of God, with its denials; and then of the Spiritual Idea of man and the attempts to negative it. Each of these, while incapable of mathematical demonstration, he insists "are supreme ideas of reason, confirmed as necessities of thought by their rationality and universality." From this follows the scientific method of a sound theistic study, which must be three-fold: "Observation, the historic and scientific; Reasoning, the philosophical; Intuition, the spiritual." This is the basis of his

analysis and indicates the general division of the study. In the consideration of the successive themes one is struck with an all too rare combination of profound reverence and intellectual courage. Dr. Micou really believes in the reason of man; of it he is never afraid; *but he is never its slave.* This makes his method so singularly appealing. His is the method of the Greek Church Fathers with their appeal made to the spiritual nature of man with the underlying conviction of the adaptability of the human soul for direct human knowledge. But the witness of the reason in its final summing up clearly is this, the unequivocal position of our author, " Christianity is essentially the response of the spirit in faith and self-surrender to the revelation of God in Christ, and not the conclusion of any process of reasoning or of intellectual analysis."

Benjamin S. Sanderson.

Conduct and the Supernatural: By Lionel Spencer Thornton. Longmans, Green & Company, 1915.

The old question whether the Gospel can justify its dogmatic claim has given place in these latter days to a more searching criticism on the part of unbelief. Not only are historic foundations at stake, but the very ideals of Christianity, its rule of conduct and its standard of goodness, are challenged. The attack has shifted from theoretical to practical grounds and merely gained in cogency, and the old method of defense, as it appears in traditional apologetics, seems singularly flat and ineffective. The merit of Mr. Thornton's book lies largely in a clear appreciation of this fact. The author is concerned to establish the validity of the *life* revealed in Jesus Christ as the only solution of the problem of human conduct. Thus his appeal is of immediate and pressing interest, and one turns eagerly to his argument as germane to all that is of intimate importance to society as well as to the individual.

The old sequence of method holds,— the first half of the book is concerned chiefly with criticism, the latter part alone is constructive. But whereas often the critical portion of such treatises is strong and clear, and one is destined to disappointment when the author begins to build on the foundation which he has prepared, the exact reverse is true in the present instance. Nietzsche, John Davidson, Shaw, Wells and H. S. Chamberlain are successively passed in review as representative of the attempt to evolve a working philosophy of life on a purely naturalistic basis. The treatment of Nietzsche is more sympathetic than that accorded to the others in the list; indeed an underlying ele-

ment of agreement with the Christian ideal, when this ideal is rightly understood, is discovered in the doctrine of this avowedly embittered opponent. This is what might have been expected in a writer of Mr. Thornton's affiliations, and is probably a more just and discerning judgment than the unqualified condemnation which is commonly meted out by those who have but a superficial knowledge of that strange and erratic genius. We would commend a telling quotation from "Thus spake Zarathustra," on page 279 of the present volume, to all ease-loving Christians who are enamoured of the ways of compromise.

But in trying to extract a logical system of ethics from the brilliant and paradoxical utterances of Mr. Shaw and H. G. Wells one is on somewhat uncertain ground. Doubtless a case is made out against the theory propounded. But one feels that the subtle appeal of these writers to the popular mind is not adequately met, that the real underlying strength of their argument is evaded. The fact is that they do not lend themselves to methodical refutation, and the laborious proof that they fail to furnish an adequate moral system in place of the Christian scheme which they reject is somewhat like wasted energy.

When, however, the argument passes from this negative phase to direct exposition of the main thesis of the book we get more effective results. There is no coquetting with semi-rationalistic concessions,—no dividing of the ground between "natural" and "revealed" in the sphere of morals. To the Christian the centre must needs be Christ, and the whole of life is irradiated by the truth which He has revealed. The centre of motive is shifted from self to Christ, and thus the whole moral ideal is grounded not in individual or social well-being but in Heaven, that is in God and the life of the soul as it is hidden with Christ in God. The key-note of conduct is found in the Pauline phrase "in Christ" (ἐν Χρίστω.) The author makes no apology or explanation for his use of the word "supernatural." All the fine verbal byplay to which we have grown used, by which the word is emptied of all that might offend, is conspicuously absent. Man is conscious of sin, not merely of shortcoming and imperfection. If he is to lead the good life he needs not only knowledge of the good but power from outside himself whereby he may accomplish it. And this power comes from incorporation in the living Christ, whereby his whole orientation is changed. He no longer lives for self but for Christ, other-worldliness is not a dream of the future but a present experience, his "citizenship is in Heaven."

With all its solid value it must be admitted that the book is hardly likely to convince those who are not already assured of the substantial

truth of the Christian position. Its style is somewhat hard and lacking in persuasiveness. But as teaching Christians where their true strength lies, namely in a bold assertion of the unique quality of the Christian claim and a refusal to soften down the hard sayings of the Gospel in the hope of conciliating waverers, the book is of high value and significance. One wonders a little, however, that the author misses the evident opportunity to emphasize the corollary of his argument, that when Christians *live* the supernatural life, then and not till then will the skeptic be convinced.

Wilford L. Robbins.

The Will to Freedom, or *The Gospel of Nietzsche and the Gospel of Christ.* By John Neville Figgis, D.D., Litt.D. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1917. $1.50.

These lectures were delivered by Dr. Figgis at Lake Forest College on the Bross Foundation in May, 1915. Since then the text has been rewritten and many notes have been added. Dr. Figgis wishes it to be understood that his interest in Nietzsche is not due to the war, and does not date from 1914. He has not touched upon the question as to what extent Nietzsche may be held responsible for the ruling ideas of modern Germany. The fact that he was lecturing in a neutral country was a sufficient reason for not entering upon any such discussion. The reader however is free to draw his own inferences; and one need not read far to discover that Nietzsche's teaching contains many ideas with which we have of late become distressingly familiar. These lectures therefore are nothing if not seasonable.

This is just the book we have long desired. Nietzsche's attack on Christian morality has undoubtedly had an undermining influence in many souls; and it required a scholar of the learning and lucidity of Dr. Figgis to make a popular defense of the Christian system. Nietzsche's contention was that Judaism and Christianity were slave religions, and that they succeeded in making dominant in the world a slave system of morality. Both Jews and Christians have always been an impotent, decaying folk; and they have sought to obtain revenge upon their tyrannical masters by destroying the classic ideals of morality as exhibited in the strong men of antiquity, and substituting for them the virtues of the weak. Nietzsche said, "Morality is the idiosyncrasy of the decadent revenging themselves upon life." In his opinion all morality is decadence. Ascending life is ever pitiless and proud.

Dr. Figgis answers Nietzsche's criticism of Christianity by proving, in his most incisive manner, that much of Nietzsche's attack is due to a misconception of Christianity.

In the first place, Nietzsche confuses Christianity with the pessimism of Schopenhauer. It is true that both teach self-denial and asceticism; but the ultimate purpose of self-denial is different in the two systems. Schopenhauer, like the oriental pessimists, aimed at the annihilation of personality; while Christianity aims at its complete development. Nietzsche hated Christianity because he foolishly thought that it culminated in the destruction of the will to live. But our Lord said, "I am come that they might have life, and have it more abundantly."

In the second place, Nietzsche thought that Christianity was too soft in teaching pure altruism, and in carrying sympathy too far. The effect of such teaching he held would be to make material comfort the idol of civilization. Here again he entirely misconceived the Christian position. Christians are continually being blamed because they are callous to suffering, as for example when they refuse to condemn all war, and adhere strictly to monogamic marriage. Christianity in fact is a very strict and severe religion, and makes short shrift of sentimentality.

In the same manner Dr. Figgis deals with Nietzsche's attack on Christianity as hostile to culture, as paying special homage to the tame anaemic virtues, and as making all souls equal before God and thereby denying the aristocracy of character. Moreover Nietzsche thought he was attacking Christian morality, when he was really attacking the ethics of Kant and all others who would construct Christian moral codes. As Dr. Figgis well says, "Christianity is not a code, but a spirit. Love to God and to our neighbor is the principle. The ordinary rules of morals are merely formulae, which express the application of this principle under normal conditions. There are cases when they do not apply. That is the excuse for casuistry, which discusses all these cases on the edge."

Dr. Figgis however does not believe that Nietzsche was "only a Christian who had lost his way." He shows how many points Nietzsche had in common with Catholic Christianity; his mystical attitude toward life, his condemnation of pessimism, his recognition that man is in a bad plight and needs a change of nature, his idealization of heroism, and his use of suffering. Indeed Dr. Figgis is most generous in his appreciation of the many fine qualities of this misguided genius. But when all is said in Nietzsche's favour that can be said, the fact remains that his idea of redemption by the superman is fundamentally anti-Christian.

" It is based on the notion of pride. Not only is it anti-Christian; the superman, as Nietzsche preaches him, is inexpressibly vulgar. The notion of force without any direction — for he says repeatedly that life has no meaning nor goal — would ultimately be no less destructive of the culture which Nietzsche desired." Therefore Dr. Figgis will not " be so cruel as to tear from his melancholy brow that laurel-wreath which he himself had placed thereon — the title of Antichrist." S. P. D.

The School of Divine Love, the Science of the Saints in Daily Life. By the Rev. Jesse Brett, L.Th., Chaplain of All Saints' Hospital, Eastbourne. pp. 179. New York: Longmans, Green & Co. $1.20 net.

The author of this book is well and favorably known in the realm of devotional literature, and we are prepared to find an able treatment of his great subject. Great times have called forth the best and strongest in human nature. The World War has been a time of testing and proving religious values, and may have been awakened to needs long unacknowledged, to want more and deeper satisfaction of soul than they have found in their former indefinite religious practices. The National Mission in England brought into clear light the Faith once for all delivered to the Saints.

The underlying thought of these pages is that the love of God is the interpretation of the inner glory of the Faith. The love of God Himself is the only satisfaction of the human soul, and the cultivation of its knowledge by study, prayer, and action, the work of the true disciple. In his twelve chapters the author essays to describe the universality and attractiveness of the Divine Love, and its inspiring power leading to its own perfection in the attainment of the Ideal. Indeed, we are led in mystic contemplation to the highest mountain tops, and although the atmosphere seems at times too rarefied for mortal men, we feel that it is good to have been uplifted for a while above the level of the plains of mediocrity in which we are so prone to pitch our tents, in an attempt to arrive at the enthusiastic affection of the Saints and to enter into the meaning of expressions quite unlike our own. We especially commend the chapter which treats of The Prayer of Love, and it is with some relief that we read, on page 113, that " simplicity is a note of true sanctity. Great Saints are generally remarkable for their simple un-self-consciousness, and yet they may be the most favored of God ".

The thought of the Divine Love appears to us so great as to baffle human comprehension and definition. Few men would venture to handle it, few are able to penetrate at all deeply into the Science of the Saints,

but our author is a skilful pedagogue, and his book can be recommended to all who would be disciples in this School, and to quote from his conclusion, page 179, " God who teaches us of His Own Divine Love, sets no limit either to His teaching, or to our attainment, save that which we make for ourselves by our own unwillingness, faithlessness, or sin. If we have learned from Him the way of love, if we have proved by experience what He is to those who love Him, we have the beginning in ourselves of that which may develop into perfection, and to our eternal joy in love, in God, Whom to possess forever is the joy of His Saints ".

W. H. B.

Before the Morning Watch. By the Rev. F. A. Iremonger, Rector of Quarley. New York: Longmans, Green & Co. 90 cents net.

This volume of 172 pages has an Introduction by the Bishop of London, and is one of a List of Special Books for Lenten Reading recommended by him. It contains a series of Meditations on the several verses of the 130th Psalm, which with its plaintive cry of Repentance and confident appeal to Hope had so real a meaning for the English Church and Nation in a very trying Lent that tested courage and faithfulness to the utmost. It is, as the Introduction tells us, written in blood and watered with tears, and if it is read in the spirit in which it was written, it cannot fail to give its message of comfort and warning and inspiration to a world which needs them. And Lent is past, but the War cloud which colored these Meditations hovers close upon us and threatens to burst upon our own country. History repeats itself, and we are ready to take up Israel's De Profundis, the humble trustful cry of penitence and patient confidence in God.

The title is of course taken from verse 6 of the Prayer Book Version of the Psalm, which differs from the more accurate Revised translation, though this is not material to the author's purpose, which has already been sufficiently indicated. Each chapter contains many helpful things, but chapters 4 and 6 on Humility and Penitence in Prayer, and the Spirit of Holy Fear are especially notable, as also the concluding chapter which aptly describes the nature of Sin as consisting in a condition rather than an act or acts,— a Condition of independence of God, and of self-satisfaction, pride, and self-will.

This is a book which might fill the whole of one Lent, and may thoroughly be recommended to those who can sympathize with deep religious experience. In an early chapter the author speaks of the duty of loving God with all our mind, apart from the daily study of the Bible, in

the use of really valuable religious literature. We may fairly apply his words to the volume before us, " How much more profitable would be our Lent if we could determine to read one — it need be only one — standard book of Christian faith or practice, between Ash Wednesday and Easter Day . . . . There are few things which deepen our own personal religion more than to follow carefully the unfolding, by the hand of a master, of any subject which bears upon the joys and difficulties of the Christian life, or the teaching of the Church ".

W. H. B.

The Call of Lent to Penitence, Discipline, and Christ. By H. C. G. Moule, D. D., Bishop of Durham, New York: Edwin S. Gorham. 80 cents net.

A work from the hands of Bishop Moule, with the sponsorship of the S. P. C. K. enters the world of devotional literature under happy auspices and bespeaks its own value. The present work consists of short readings or meditations for each week day in Lent, suitable for use in Church or at home. The subjects selected are — Sin, Discipline, and The Cross, with a final chapter on " The Power of His Resurrection "; in the treatment of each subject the author displays a wonderful power of analysis, and that deep personal experience of godly fear, lowly penitence, and watchful discipline which has characterized the best school of Evangelical Churchmanship. The author's mind is plainly conscious of the World War and the recent National Mission of the Church of England which have given a new significance and value to the religious observance of Lent with its tender and glorious climax in the Passion and Easter. The book is full of choice sayings, but some passages are of singular beauty, as, when in the first chapter (p. 13), the author, as it were, summarizes the theme of his book by telling us that Lent in harmony with its sterner suggestions is intended also to be a name of beauty and light. " Lent means Spring. And Spring is, to be sure, the time of winds keen and strong, of showering clouds, and ever and again of snow and the sting of frost. But also it is the time of the bird's blessed voices in the budding trees, and of the shining out of the black earth of the beloved flowers under the reviving sun. Not otherwise Lent is indeed the season of renewed severities . . . but it has also to do with the vernal growths of the peace and joy of faith, and with the fair beauties of the life of love, and with the song of victory over all temptation in the vital brightness of the slain and living Christ of God."

Lent is past, but not so our need of recalling its purposes. Devout spiritual meditations such as these will always be seasonable both for the

clergy and for laymen, and surely never more appropriate than in the present times of distress of nations and perplexity.

W. H. B.

Further Pages of My Life. By the Right Reverend W. Boyd Carpenter, K.C.V.O., D.D., D.C.L., formerly Bishop of Ripon. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

By way of supplement to his former book, "Some Pages of My Life," the distinguished author has given us this volume of somewhat fragmentary and entirely unconventional reflections mingled with intimate reminiscences of the joys and sorrows of his private life, written without any other thought than of recording frankly and honestly things as they were, or as they appeared to the writer. The early chapters are mostly personal, but the chapter headed "Clerical Peccadilloes" relates some experiences of the author as a bishop (here we find the trite remark that, like the body, the diocese is unaware of its organs except when there is local disturbance, and then the head knows that there is trouble) and very human in its mingled pathos and humor is the study given us from real life of several strange cases of clerical delinquency. Some chapters will be appreciated better by those who are conversant with English ways, and the notices of F. W. Robertson and John Henry Shorthouse by those with whom they were, if not contemporary, at least recent memories.

Few are so well qualified as Bishop Boyd Carpenter to give personal recollections of the late King Edward, or to describe the really great qualities manifested by this monarch in his short but glorious reign, but chief of all in interest is the chapter which gives us some insight into the better side of the character of the man who figures so largely at the present time of war and calamity, the Emperor William, all of which is well worth reading and considering, "And this is the pity of it all" the author concludes, "he might have been so great. He might have left to history the record of a reign which had done good to the world, and at the same time conferred glory and prosperity on his own country; but now for all time he will be known as the man who was chiefly responsible for the wickedest war ever waged, for the awful carnage, for the world-wide sorrow, and for the sad alienation of hearts which it has brought in its train. For one fact stands out clear and certain to all who read the official correspondence: a word from the Emperor in those critical July and August days of 1914 would have made war impossible, and that word was not spoken." W. H. B.

The False Decretals. By E. H. Davenport, B.A., Lothian Prizeman, 1914. Oxford: B. H. Blackwell. New York Agents: Longmans, Green & Co. MCMXVI. $1.50 net.

This is a careful re-examination of the famous " forged " or " pseudo-Isidorean " Decretals which came to have a connection, albeit an undesigned connection probably, with the building up of the claim of the Bishop of Rome to supremacy. Now that the authenticity of the documents has been discredited beyond hope of reversal the task of treating the Decretals in an unbiased and non-controversial way is not a difficult one. They present interesting problems for the historian to solve, if he can. Mr. Davenport attempts to present solutions of several related questions. He gathers together the evidence to elucidate " the environment, the substance and the influence of the Pseudo-Isidore's work " and he ventures a " judgment on the place in history of the Pseudo-Isidorean Decretals." The contention of the majority of historians of every school is upheld, that the Pseudo-Isidorean forgeries were all published with the same intent —" the protection and advancement of the Frankish priesthood." What is not emphasized is that by playing off the patriarchal authority of the Roman Bishop against the authority of other Metropolitans the position of the former became necessarily unique in the West, thus giving an impulse to the idea of uniqueness in other ways. An " impression " was allowed to be fostered. The writer estimates the work of the compiler not so much " a forgery written with deceit " as " a legend written with a moral." He thinks that in that age " history, written ostensibly to edify, was little short of legend." Very likely, but that is just the kind of writing that today often passes muster as " history " and with just the same bad results. The student of documents will find Mr. Davenport's study one of the best on this subject. A. W. J.

Does Christ Still Heal. By Henry B. Wilson, B.D., Director of the Society of the Nazarene. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., $1.00 net.

The Society of the Nazarene is an organization which aims to bring about a restoration of the ministry of healing as practised in the Apostolic church, and the book before us contains a fuller explication by its Director of his previous book entitled " The Revival of the Gift of Healing " which has received sympathetic and favorable notice and reached a second edition. The attention of thoughtful Christian people is called to a subject of far more importance than many realise, which has been forced to the foreground in these days by the enormous growth

of organizations which make bodily healing practically the centre of their religion, and we are compelled to find an answer to the question whether the Church is fulfilling her duty in carrying out the high commission given by our Lord.

The author gives us a careful examination of the Christian view of sickness, and a presentation of the permanency of the divine commission to heal. In substance he inquires whether pain and suffering are sent us by God for our good, or whether are they the work of the Devil, and therefore to be fought and conquered. Moreover did Christ's commission to his disciples to " heal the sick " terminate with the death of the apostles, or is it still in active existence, and available for us when called upon? These are the vital questions with which the author deals basing his arguments on the words and deeds of Christ as recorded in the Gospels.

Probably all will agree as to the need of revision of our Prayer Book in the way of enrichment and of greater flexibility, but we think that the author's severe criticism of our present prayers for the sick and of the Visitation Office is mistaken. Nor can we follow him in his rather contemptuous rejection of sickness as a chastisement, and the remedial value of pain. In short the existence and purpose of pain and suffering has always appeared to us so mysterious as to afford a problem practically insoluble in our present state of knowledge. We are inclined to doubt whether the miraculous gift of healing was not in fact withdrawn when the need of that method of Divine utterance had ceased. May not the power have been transmitted to reappear in the form of medical and surgical skill not less wonderful and susceptible of religious sanctions?

This, of course, begs the whole question, and we are driven to conclude that the proof of the author's thesis must be found, if at all, in actual practice.

It is not lack of faith but love for the truth which prompts us still to ask " How does Christ in the present day exercise his power of healing," and we think that experience rather than argument will supply the answer. W. H. B.